


IS IT
A NEW WORLD
?



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

IS IT A NEW WORLD?

So
D1338i Daily Telegraph, London

Is It a New World?

A Series of Articles and Letters contributed
by Correspondents to the "Daily Telegraph,"
August—September, 1920

WITH A FOREWORD BY
W. L. COURTNEY

172/21
15/6/22

PUBLISHED FOR THE "DAILY TELEGRAPH"

BY

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LIMITED

LONDON

NEW YORK AND TORONTO



PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S.E. 1,
AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

FOREWORD

THE articles and letters included in this volume form a curious chapter in the annals of contemporary thought. The question, Is it a New World?—originally suggested by Viscount Burnham—to which they are an answer, was found to be one which a large number of people were asking themselves, with an intense interest only equalled by the baffling variety of their opinions and standpoints. Dean Inge's letter, which was the starting-point of the whole discussion, raised certain points of controversy, which, debated backwards and forwards, ran through most of the contributions sent to the Editor of the *Daily Telegraph*, in solution, or partial solution, of the problem which had been propounded. The main distinction between the views of the Optimist and the Pessimist remained clear throughout the whole correspondence, but it was overlaid and diversified by a number of subordinate points, as each writer put forward the main critical issues which appealed to his own intelligence. It is inevitable, of course, that every controversy should decline from the large initial conceptions with which it starts to the smaller and more acutely felt interests and prejudices of the individual. But if the papers in this volume are read with discrimination, it will become obvious that all the writers try honestly to deal with the cardinal question—involving, as it does, the tremendous issue

of the reality of human progress. Some twenty years ago the *Daily Telegraph* started a controversy on the subject, "Do we Believe?", in which I took some share both in initiation and guidance. The correspondence in the present controversy—which occupied some four weeks—reveals a similar sincerity and breadth of outlook, a similar pathetic eagerness and interest, as were exhibited on the former occasion.

"Is it a New World?" definitely raises the question whether humanity is advancing or retrograding. If we believe that through all the agony of the recent War, we have now advanced to new and valuable conceptions, then we are on the side of Dr. Pangloss and can still dare to call this "the best of possible worlds." If on the contrary our minds are—as is only natural—obsessed with the ugly squalor of carnage and the hideous massacre of millions of young lives, many of them bright with the promise of future success in Art and Science and Civilisation, then we shall be tempted to turn from old shibboleths no longer of any service, to the dreary creed of Despair. We may interpret the Gospel of Despair in the worst sense, as a negation of the theory of a Divine Providence; or we may suggest various palliatives and exceptions which soften the conclusion to the temper of our own hearts. But in one way or another we are bound to confront the tragic problem whether socially or ethically or spiritually we are so far better than our fathers that we see the possibility of reconstructing a new world out of the shattered structures of the old. The past, clearly, is gone beyond recall. Is there a present which we can fashion to our better liking? A hundred years ago our forefathers were

busy, building as they thought a new European structure. Shall we succeed in our tasks any better than they did? Or is failure as inevitable in our case as we now see it was inevitable in theirs?

As to definite results, they are no more to be expected from a controversy of this kind than they are from a formal debate at St. Stephen's. Each writer has his own point of view and lays down principles which appeal to his own settled convictions and prejudices. The conclusions arrived at are relative to his frame of mind: they have little or no pertinence, perhaps, to his next-door neighbour. But it is of immense value to have a subject of this kind argued from different standpoints: the problem is not solved but it is touched, in an illuminating fashion, from various sides.

Nevertheless, one or two results emerged from the chaos of conflicting opinion. It became clear, to begin with, that practically no one believed in an absolutely new world. A new world, it was argued, in the sense of a *tabula rasa* contradicted our notions of the slow process of evolution. Each age must be dependent in many obvious ways on preceding ages and every new generation bears on its shoulders the heritage of ancestral merit or ancestral defeat. If we disbelieve in progress, there is nothing more to be said. Under that supposition we are like children building castles on the sand which the next tide will wash away. But if we assume that humanity has the power of so altering old conditions as to render life more amenable to civilising agencies, and to improve, by slow, tentative efforts the very conception of civilisation, then, though it is no new world

that we are creating, we can at least get rid of some ugly features of the old world and so add our quota of work to the laborious enterprise of social and ethical culture. It is no good deploring our weaknesses or folding our hands in apathetic indolence. We must "increase our output," just as we are exhorting the miners to do. We must think more of the interests of the community and less of our personal greed. Above all, we must have hope and faith, without which our efforts lack inspiration and the promise of success. On the whole, if our correspondence has taught us nothing else, it has at least brought home to our minds how sanely and temperately the vast majority of our correspondents regard the problems before them and how resolutely they have accepted the duty incumbent on them of unselfish co-operation in all manly endeavour.

W. L. COURTNEY.

Daily Telegraph,
November 1920.

* * * *The principal writers who contributed to
this discussion are—*

	PAGE
DR. INGE, DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S	5
PROFESSOR BURY	11
SIR ANTHONY HOPE HAWKINS, K.B.E.	17
LUCAS MALET	29
M. RENÉ DOUMIC	44
RIGHT HON. G. N. BARNES, M.P. ,	58

FOREWORD

ix

	PAGE
MR. W. L. COURTNEY, LL.D.	75
M. EMILE CAMMAERTS	88
SIR SIDNEY LOW	98
REV. R. F. HORTON, D.D.	115
RIGHT HON. J. R. CLYNES M.P.	129
MR. W. L. GEORGE	142
SIR SIDNEY LEE, D.C.L.	154
M. RAYMOND POINCARÉ (EX-PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC)	172
BISHOP WELLDON, DEAN OF DURHAM	188
MR. G. K. CHESTERTON	219
GENERAL BOOTH	231
REV. HERBERT BARNES	255

CONTENTS

	PAGE
IS IT A NEW WORLD?	1
THE RIDDLE OF THE FUTURE	5
CONTROL OF SCIENCE	11
DUTIES AND SACRIFICES	17
THE REAL AND THE IDEAL	22
WANTED, A LEADER	23
CHURCHES AND LABOUR	26
THE ANCIENT WISDOM	29
THE PERENNIAL CONTROVERSY	35
THE CONSISTENT PESSIMIST	38
A NEW MAGNA CHARTA	41
THE GOSPEL OF WORK	44
AN APPEAL TO MORALITY	51
A TOO DOGMATIC CHRISTIANITY	54
THE WORLD OF UNREST	55
RESORT TO REASON	58
AN AGE OF MATERIALISM	62
CHRISTIANITY AND ECONOMICS	68
GOSPEL OF SELFISHNESS	70
MEANING OF PROGRESS	75

	PAGE
A NATION CRYING FOR GUIDANCE.	81
OUR UNCHANGING LAWS	86
THE OLD ORDER CHANGETH	86
STUBBORN FAITH OF 1914	88
A MONEY-POISONED CREED	92
THE ABNEGATION OF SELF	95
LIFE'S GREATEST LESSON	96
IDEALS AND REALITIES	98
PRECEPT AND EXAMPLE	107
THE GOSPEL OF WORK	109
THE DOGMA OF THE CHURCH	111
FORCE IN ITSELF NOT WRONG	112
BETTER RELATIONS	115
A MORE UNSETTLED WORLD	120
THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN	123
A WORLD ADRIFT	125
BROTHERHOOD OF SACRIFICE	127
CLASS CO-OPERATION	129
EDUCATION AND UNREST	134
THE WORKER WINS	135
THE SCRIPTURAL PROMISE	139
STRENGTH OF IDEALISM	142
"ARTISAN" AND THE CHURCH	148
CHRISTIANITY AND PROGRESS	151
DISILLUSIONMENT	154

CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
LOST WAR IDEALS	165
THE CLOSING OF AN EPOCH	167
A TEACHER'S VIEWS	170
ENGLAND AND FRANCE	172
AN INDIAN VIEW	177
LOST LOYALTY	182
MERCY TO THE UNDER-DOG	184
THE POWER OF THE MASSES	186
THE EVOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL MORALITY	188
THE PRODUCTIVE UNIT	193
EVOLUTION AND FAITH	197
PSEUDO-SCIENTIFIC "FACTS"	198
AN EXODUS FROM EUROPE?	200
A MIDDLE-CLASS VIEW	205
THE GOLDEN RULE	208
A SPIRITUAL UPHEAVAL	210
PATRIOTISM AND SOCIALISM	213
EVOLUTION AND RELIGION	215
STARTING AFRESH	219
TRUTH, JUSTICE AND FRIENDSHIP	227
THE UNSEEN FORCES	281
THREE THOUSAND YEARS HENCE	237
NOMINAL CHRISTIANITY	239
PLAYING THE GAME	241
THE "LEAGUE OF SOME NATIONS"	243

	PAGE
A DEFENCE OF MATERIALISM	245
THE SECOND COMING	249
IN 1765	253
FOUNDATION OF SOCIAL FABRIC	258
THE WILL TO LIVE	255
LEAGUE OF THE LAW-ABIDING	260
CONGESTION AND EMIGRATION	264
PATRIOTISM AND SOCIALISM	265
THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE	267
THE CHURCH'S "ADMISSION" OF FAILURE	269
A NEW WORLD?	274

IS IT A NEW WORLD?

AN EDITORIAL

A QUESTION which deeply troubles the general mind to-day is raised in the article by Dean Inge which appears in our columns this morning.¹ It is a question that has many aspects, and will probably engage the thoughts of the ordinary citizen in some special form in which it is urged on him by his own experience. But, formulated in the broadest terms, "Is it a New World?" is the question that is present in greater or less degree to the consciousness of every reflecting person in the second year after the winning of the Great War. We all remember well, or too well, with what hopes, and under the inspiration of what ideals, the nation committed itself to the most tremendous enterprise of its history. Without those hopes and ideals it could never have been undertaken and pursued as it was; they were as real and as powerful as the titanic armaments with which the struggle was carried on. We looked forward to the establishment of a new order; of a world better than that which had turned all its energies to the business of conflict—not a world much the same in essentials, and capable of collapsing sooner or later into another welter of bloodshed and misery. We knew, whether vaguely or more definitely, what we sought, and when the guns were silent at last we began to look for the signs of attainment. What followed was a searching trial of faith; and it is proceeding still. For some

¹ See p. 8.

it has already proved too much. For some it is hard to keep the light burning while the darkness is still unlifted that enshrouds the future of the peoples. And to some it is given to keep the vision and the confidence that were their support through the years of the agony of Europe, even while that agony continues for so many millions who were involved in the ruin of militarism or in the outbreak of political incendiarism. Out of an unprecedented confusion of feeling and shifting of opinion the thought of the new time is slowly shaping itself. It may be, and probably it will be, long before the minds of the majority of men and women arrive at any such condition of clearness and settlement as they knew in the days before the great upheaval. The mass of people will never think alike, any more than they did in those days; but they will come to know what they think, and why they think it, with a degree of precision which was once normal and natural, and which was reflected in the old division of parties and sections of opinion upon political or other subjects. For the present, however, the persistent pressure of more or less disturbing events, the disappearance of so many familiar landmarks, the apparent uselessness of experience as a guide, are having the effect that was to be expected, and humanity at large is able to discern little beyond the immediate practical difficulty or the urgent practical need. At no time in recent history has it been so hard to see life steadily, and see it whole.

At the same time, that effort is being made by individual minds in every section of society; and it is through their activity and controversy that new

pathways of public thought are already being surveyed, new bases of conviction and new lines of cleavage already being laid down. There is nothing more to be desired than that public attention should be directed and held to these beginnings of a resettlement of our ideas; and for that reason we think some service may be done by opening our columns to correspondence upon the broad question raised by Dean Inge to-day. There is so much upon which men have to re-examine themselves, perhaps to lead mental revolutions against themselves. On a reconsideration of familiar values, for example, are we to emerge from the present chaos with exactly the same thoughts and feelings about nationality as we had before? It is upon the answer to that question that the existence of the League of Nations, if it is to be anything more than a shadow, depends; for whatever authority may be given to it must represent a proportionate sacrifice of sovereignty made by each of its members. Is it a new world in the sense that such a sacrifice is to be reckoned upon? What is the outlook for a greater understanding and sympathy between nations than existed hitherto? An inquiry that goes deep in this connection suggests itself. How much of what we witness in the world to-day is due to the condition of nervous strain, leading to loss of balance and self-mastery, that is the legacy of a long and exhausting war? May we look for a general recovery, in time, from that affliction, and the building up of a state of mind, and a spiritual condition, in which things will really become possible that could not be considered so a few years since? To put the question in another way, are the peoples

yet in a fit state to lay to heart the deeper lessons of the war? Is any one nation—our own, for instance—in such a state? It has known, in war-time, a degree of unity without any parallel in its records. Is the reaction from that to take us back in permanence to the old conditions of party rancour and class conflict, with no ground gained for a nobler sort of public spirit? Again, in a new world religion and morals should show a new development. What is the outlook here? We have touched upon a few only of the multitude of matters occupying the thoughts of so many who are striving to look deeper and farther than the day's perplexity and disillusion, or its flighty optimism and self-deception. If a public discussion should have the effect of adding to the numbers of those who are working for a steady point of view we should be proud to have provided a forum for it.

RIDDLE OF THE FUTURE

BY DEAN INGE

“HUMANITY,” said General Smuts in his great speech on the League of Nations, “has struck its tents, and is once more on the march.” Humanity is always on the march; but, like the patriarch Abraham, and unlike troops led by General Smuts, it marches “not knowing whither it goeth”; and it usually describes what logicians call a vicious circle. This fact may be disconcerting to the professional optimist, a foolish, amiable creature who would buy from a Jew and sell to a Scot and expect to make a profit; but it is reassuring to those who watch the foundations of social life crumbling before their eyes, and wonder whether anything of value will be left standing. It was said by a wise man long ago: “Things refuse to be badly administered for long.” All institutions carry with them the seeds of their own decay, but all revolutions quickly devour their own children. Two things alone remain unchanged—human nature and inhuman nature, the laws of the world we live in. When one or the other is altered, we shall get the new world about which we prate, but not till then.

The late war was made by the guardians of the then existing order in Central Europe. They made it chiefly because they saw that that order was being

undermined by what is euphemistically called "social unrest." It was a gambler's throw, and the result was the worst that could have happened for them, and perhaps for us, too. For the conflicting forces were so evenly balanced that the struggle went on until the old order, to preserve which it was begun, was entirely wrecked, just as the long continuance of the Wars of the Roses ruined the social order of the Middle Ages in England. Broadly speaking, all who in 1914 had anything to lose have lost it or are losing it. That this statement is not too strong may be proved by comparing the price of good securities in 1914 with the price of the same stocks now, and by comparing the purchasing power of the interest on debentures in 1914 with its purchasing power now after deducting income tax and super-tax. The working man, in partnership with a small class of profiteers, is at present engaged in looting what the war left of the old wealth. His prosperity cannot last, for in many trades he is not even trying to earn his pay. He is "waxing fat and kicking" on the accumulations of a hundred years of peace and industry, and these will soon have disappeared. We have to look forward to a long period of acute distress, from which we shall emerge sadder but wiser men. Then the real period of reconstruction will begin. What the Government calls "reconstruction" is simply the completion of the work of destruction which the war left unfinished. The wisdom of the Cabinet may be gauged by their precious scheme of encouraging the bricklayer to do about two and a half hours' work a day, and paying him exorbitant wages out of the rates.

So much for the economic situation, which must dominate all other problems. There cannot be any more great wars in our generation, for no Government can borrow any more money, and no army would consent to fight. The Russians are a sinister exception; they have lost everything, and are transformed into a pack of wolves. Bolshevism is nearing its end; but Russia is ready for an ambitious general to play the part of Napoleon. The Moscow terrorists are afraid to recall their armies.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

I am not bold enough to prophesy about the League of Nations, the success of which I, of course, ardently desire. Every one wants peace; but has there ever been a time when the large majority in every country has not wanted peace? Lord Grey has recently said that the fruitful causes of international trouble are ignorance and misconception. I wish I could agree with him, for ignorance, though an intractable disease, is not absolutely incurable. If mankind could "let the ape and tiger die," they might ultimately succeed in suppressing the donkey. But I fear that peace has worse enemies than ignorance. I see more wisdom in what a great German publicist said to me about eight years ago: "International animosities do not matter much; but where there is fear there is danger." Fear is one great cause of war: and another is the clash of irreconcilable ambitions. If two men want the same woman, they will not submit the case to arbitration; and no more will two nations, if they are convinced that they must either expand

or starve. If we look at the names of the chief supporters of the League of Nations, we shall find among them many pure idealists; but we shall also find many who have no love of peace and goodwill in their hearts, and who only wish to clear the ground for a civil war of classes. And what will be the attitude of these men, who represent very powerful interests, when the Asiatics claim their rights, as they certainly will, to equal treatment under the League of Nations? There is probably no country in which the Asiatic, if he were allowed to settle in it, would not prove himself economically a better man than the white. He is at present kept out of the new countries, half empty though they are, by force—that is to say, in the last resort, by knocking him on the head. Is the white man prepared to surrender the “methods of barbarism,” in which alone he is the superior, and to establish a reign of universal peace and fair play, which may lead to his own supersession and disappearance? A public meeting in America or Australia would not leave us in much doubt about the answer. But as long as the claim to race privilege is maintained, the League of Nations could exist only as a monstrously unjust alliance of the rich countries against the poor. The Chinese, for example, would be excluded from the American and Australian continents because they are addicted to the vices of industry and plain living. Such an alliance would lack the strength of any moral sanction; it would be as un-Christian as the sophistries of those who quoted “Cursed be Canaan” in justification of negro slavery. Additional obstacles in the way of the League have been interposed by the old game

of grab, as played at Versailles. Germans and Americans, unfairly but not unnaturally, compare us to a gambler who, having won a big stake, proposes that the party shall play for love during the rest of the evening. We cannot seriously expect Germany and Austria to accept the peace which we have imposed upon them as a final and irrevocable settlement.

SPIRITUAL FORCES

These considerations are bound to be irritating, because they are both true and unpleasant. I fear that an ecclesiastic will not allay the irritation by insisting that the cause of the evil predicament is moral, and that if the world would give the Gospel of Christ a fair trial all would yet be well. He will be reminded that in practical life we must take human nature as it is, and that human nature is, unfortunately, unconverted. Some, by way of reprisals, may add that the world in its agony has got very little help from organised religion, and that the official Church of England, in particular, is not of much use except as a rather creaking political weathercock. I can only say in reply that the spiritual forces which might regenerate society are alive among us, and that though they seem sadly impotent at present, they are more likely to make themselves felt when other props have manifestly failed, and other hopes have been manifestly disappointed. Such a time of disillusion is, in my opinion, coming very soon upon the people of this country. The economic bankruptcy with which we are threatened will be also a political and a moral bankruptcy. It will be brought home to us that we

have adopted a wrong standard of values, by which a nation cannot live. When this time comes, we may be surprised to find how much real Christianity there is among us, even though at the moment we can discern no clear signs of a spiritual awakening. We are, perhaps, turning our eyes too much to the outwardly religious; much real Christianity at the present time is very unconventional and not at all inclined to advertise itself. But there must be a fund of lofty idealism and calm heroism among our people; it would be absurd to suppose that our best men were all killed in the war. Eight hundred thousand of them have been killed; but if "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church" we may be confident that those who gave their lives for England will not be found to have died in vain.

CONTROL OF SCIENCE

BY PROFESSOR BURY

AFTER we embarked on the war it was fancied that two good things might come out of it. In the first place, it was hoped that it might be the last war, and General Smuts assured us that humanity is on the march, suggesting that when it next pitches its tents it will have safely buried the corpse of Mars with military honours. A League of Nations has been instituted, but it is far from representing the world. It has not yet seized the imagination of mankind. Some are marching on the new road to Moscow, others on the old road to Endor; but humanity as a whole seems to be marching nowhere, nor even to have any idea that it is living in tents; it is simply waiting to see. It is premature to speculate about the League's chances of success, but it is evident that humanity is not enthusiastic, and Mars is still as merry as ever.

In the second place, it was hoped that the foundations of liberty, for which so many noble lives were given in the past, might be enlarged and confirmed. Liberty was recognised as the cardinal principle of Western civilisation; and if the Allies were victorious its reign would be extended and its power would penetrate even into the dark places of Russia. Mr. Wilson, indeed, when America was coming into the

war, declared that the supreme object was to make the world safe for democracy. If Imperial autocrats were the only enemies, democracy and Mr. Wilson might congratulate themselves that the world is fairly safe, as the three autocracies have disappeared. But in the meantime another enemy has arisen, in the shape of Bolshevik Communism, whose avowed aim is to destroy democracy; and Mr. Wilson and the Americans, having retired from the international scene, can hardly say that their object is achieved.

But is democracy an ideal to die for? If it meant liberty, yes; but unfortunately it may mean tyranny. In the large democratic States one observes that the tendency is to weaken the safeguards of liberty, not to strengthen them. Here majorities are tyrannising over minorities; there minorities over majorities. In England proportional representation is rejected. When the American Republic, fondly imagined to be the home and citadel of freedom, forbids its citizens to drink wine in their own houses, we may venture to question Mr. Wilson's opinion that in democracy lies the hope of the world. Look around, and everywhere liberty seems to be forgotten and obscured. Bolshevism, which has been forced upon part of the world, and all the other social experiments which theorists are eager to impose upon us have this in common, that liberty is left out. There is a collective indifference to the ideal of individual liberty that is not the least disquieting among the disquieting features of the world to-day.

WORLD SHORTAGE OF FOOD

But this and other tendencies one might point at are not due to the war, though the war may have accelerated their growth. They may be transient phenomena; an oscillation of the pendulum, to be followed by an oscillation the other way. The social and political changes which renew the world from age to age are not due to sudden reformations of human nature, but to the stimulus of new ideas, burning in the brain. The war will be one of the great landmarks in human history, but it has taught us nothing new about the capacities of man. There have been amazing examples of unsurpassable heroism; they reassured us that the race is not degenerate. There have been amazing examples of fearless fanaticism; that is not a new revelation. And so we may draw the not very exciting conclusion that men will behave in the new situations which confront them in much the same way as at other crises of history. In no country are hearts or brains changed. Does the number of people who think for themselves on the whole face of the planet run into seven figures?

It would be misspent labour to attempt to draw auguries about the future from the things that men, who have not yet recovered from the sufferings of the war and the disappointments of the peace, are saying and doing in what is evidently a transient mood. It is more useful to notice that the war has given us an unpleasant glimpse of a dangerous rock that lies ahead. We have had an experience of what universal shortage of food would mean. It is due to quite exceptional conditions, but has been acute

enough to remind us that all dreams or plans for the future of the race are futile if they ignore the question of population. That question is fundamental. A hundred and twenty years ago Mr. Malthus, a hard-headed English clergyman, explained the situation, for the first time, for mankind to ponder. He showed that if men were living in perfectly happy and healthy conditions, never decimated by war and disease and famine, the population of the world would increase so rapidly that very soon the fruits of the earth would be insufficient to feed it. His book made a great sensation, and "Malthusianism" became a familiar word; but though general prosperity increased, and with it the population of the world, throughout the nineteenth century, few seriously considered the danger which he indicated. Now, Mr. Knibbs, an official statistician in Australia, has lately warned us that, if numbers go on increasing at the present rate, the limit will be reached in about four centuries; there will not be enough food to go round. Others have calculated that the limit will be reached sooner, and perhaps it will, if the League of Nations, by international hygienic measures, should succeed in abolishing plagues. But when that day comes, no international league will avail to avert war. The most primitive and unscrupulous instinct of man would assert its power even after centuries of universal peace, and a new struggle for existence would begin. Probably it would not last long. Four centuries hence wars will mean the extermination of the race; science would see to that. The population question bears on what Tennyson called "the doubtful doom of humankind."

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

The obvious precaution is a deliberate limitation of the birth-rate in every country, and if people could be induced to adopt this policy it would, besides providing against the future danger, greatly increase general well-being at present. If there were only 25,000,000 mouths in Great Britain, how much better off we should all be, and how many social problems would easily be solved. There is, however, another side to the question. Suppose that in all white States people by common consent limited their numbers; they would be hopelessly outnumbered and ultimately overwhelmed by the yellow and black races, which are far more prolific. Should the League of Nations ever become an effective power in the world, it may be prophesied that the problem of population will one day be its gravest anxiety.

Any one who cares for long views may be struck by another fact, of a very different order, which is more likely than the war to create a new world. It is small and obscure at present, but in the course of time it may have incalculable effects. I refer to the growth of experimental psychology. Though still in its infancy, this science seems to be confirming what many believed, and many more refused to believe, that mental phenomena are, as completely as physical phenomena, subject to invariable laws. If it succeeds in formulating those laws and laying bare, if the phrase be allowed, the machinery of mind, it will be impossible for governments to ignore them. Education and criminal law, now based on fallacious or obscure axioms like the freedom of the will, will

be revolutionised, and will tend to become applied sciences like agriculture. It is to the slow and silent operations of science that we may look for a new world, not to the lessons of a war, however great, nor to the wisdom of supreme councils, nor to resolves of humanity to "strike its tents." Whether men will be happier in a world under the control of science is open to doubt; probably it will only mean a new and more efficient tyranny.

DUTIES AND SACRIFICES

BY SIR ANTHONY HOPE HAWKINS

“Is it a New World?” is an old question. Since recorded history began it has been asked repeatedly. The answer has always been an affirmative one, and it has always been wrong. Such, at least, is the first impression that we get from reading history, and in a sense it is a true one. What the eager and enthusiastic question and answer meant has never happened; the sudden change from old to new, from bad to good, the half-miraculous transformation of human society, has never come about; if it has seemed to for a moment, the delusion has been a short one; the Old World has awakened from its dream and, scratching its head, half in rue, half perhaps in relief, has decided that it has not changed after all, and, moreover, that it is not quite sure that it wants to. There are always large numbers of people, not influential people, who have their own reasons for liking to leave things pretty much as they are, and large numbers more who are afraid of changing the ills they have for something that might turn out worse.

Besides, to make a New World we must not only “scrap” admitted evils; we must revise our estimate of what we have been used to regard as the virtues and graces of life. The vices of the old order die the harder because they are, or seem to be, bound up with its virtues as it were in pairs; militarism with

valour and self-sacrifice; patriotism with the lust of conquest and commercial greed; religious ardour with intolerance; old loyalties with obstinate prejudices; the love of beauty and the encouragement of the arts with inordinate wealth and luxury. Here—to name no more—are wheat and tares which it is not easy to separate, to garner the good grain for the future use of mankind, while burning the rest in the fire of a new enthusiasm.

Bearing these matters in mind, we shall not, if we are wise as well as ardent, expect the New World to be born full-grown, any more than the old one was. The form of our question will rather be, “Is there going to be a better world, and what, if any, signs pointing in that direction can we discern with reasonable clearness?” Public feeling—the general conscience—in the end determines public action. Where can we discern such changes, or developments, in public feeling as may justify us in giving a hopeful answer to our question? I believe that there are two directions at least in which the current of public feeling is running strongly and permanently, and in which it will not suffer more than temporary checks.

There are two things which the conscience of the civilised world has at least condemned; it has decided that they must—somehow—be abolished.

MILITARISM AND POVERTY

The one was considered glorious, if successful; even if unsuccessful, gallant, becoming to princes and gentlemen—in modern phrase, “sporting.” That is aggressive warfare—or (we may go so far as to say) the martial spirit in general; to argue with your hand

on the hilt of your sword and to consider any other appeal craven, or at least bourgeois. The other thing has been considered inevitable, and, indeed, especially approved by God, for His own admittedly inscrutable purposes. That is poverty, *dura paupertas*; perpetual, life-long, uncertain struggle for the bare means of living, hopeless renunciation of all but the most elementary pleasures of life, of almost all its beauty and almost all its worth. And this—or a more or less close approach to it—for the lot of the majority of mankind in the countries which boasted loudest of their civilisation!

Now, however long the abolition of these two things has tarried in its coming, it has lain from the first in the womb of civilisation, if we are to attach any real or worthy meaning to that word; or perhaps it would be better to say any adequately modern and developed meaning, since it has taken centuries to read into it what the conscience of to-day demands. Against these two abominations, standing where they ought not, civilisation has begun its warfare in earnest, inspired by its two great characteristics, one intellectual, the other moral, yet so closely allied that they are hardly to be distinguished in their action and results. The two are reason and sympathy. In aggressive war men are robbed of life and of much else for the real or hoped-for gain or glory of other men; by extreme poverty they lose for the benefit of other men (we are speaking of communities of a certain degree of economic development) the fruits of their toil and the enjoyment of their lives. How can either of those results justify themselves when arraigned before the bar of reason and sympathy?

When civilisation is in earnest, when the reason and sympathy which inspire it are really efficient in determining the will and action of men and nations, it wins in the long run, though perhaps it is not safe to say that in any single matter the victory is yet absolutely complete. If civilisation is in earnest about these two abominations it will march forward—heavily burdened with the survival of antique accoutrement, and across heavy and encumbered ground, but steadily, and with lengthening strides—towards their abolition.

OPEN HEART AND OPEN MIND

But what does it mean to be in earnest about a desired object? The answer is obvious; it means to be ready to make efforts, sacrifices, and surrenders in order to achieve it—resolute efforts and disagreeable surrenders. Abelard said that God has told us that He is the Truth, but has never told us that He is what we have been accustomed to believe. So we may—and indeed ought to—continue to believe that nations, classes, and individuals have their rights, but by no means are we to assume that these rights are what they have hitherto—by the mass of operative opinion, at all events—been considered to be. They may turn out, in the new light dawning on the nascent New World, to be something quite different, much greater here, much less there. We may—"shall" is the better word, if we have the courage to write it—have to make sacrifices which, according to the old order of ideas, would have seemed not merely unreasonable, but humiliating, and even perhaps disgraceful.

We shall have to be ready to sacrifice not only what seems to be our interest, our wealth, our pleasure, but also our dignity, pride, and prejudices. Perhaps even our well-considered convictions of justice, whether as between man and man, class and class, or nation and nation, may have to go. We have not only to resolve to vindicate the Right; we have, in half-a-hundred matters of human concern, to discover what it is.

An open heart is much commoner than an open mind. Both are needed for our talk, but the more urgent demand is, as usual, for the rarer commodity. Most people who advocate the wrong thing honestly think it, and are honestly convinced that they are in the right. That is the tragedy—and the great obstacle. The London man-about-town, who perhaps has never done a stroke of work in his life, passionately and sincerely denounces the claims of "Labour." The extreme wing of "Labour" will concede nothing to brains and leadership. Both lack the open mind.

The difficulties, then, are obviously great. Nevertheless, the omens are favourable with regard to the two great evils which we have touched upon here. There is a determination against aggressive war of a strength and solidity such as, I think, has never been known before. The well-to-do classes have submitted to unparalleled taxation with notable good temper. Labour has made some mistakes, but broadly its claims are no more than the general conscience recognises to be reasonable and just. Men of different nations and different classes are more ready to hear one another, to argue and discuss, and to settle matters according to the merits of the

case. If this temper holds and grows, there is good hope.

And if society were once free of militarism and of grinding poverty, what a difference on the earth! Then we might hope, without foolishness, that in time all other things would be added unto us.

THE REAL AND THE IDEAL

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The real New World which must come (but which gets dreadfully delayed) will be brought about quicker by teaching the mass about God as He really is, the Real God that is only known by a comparative few, the Real God which will pervade all with the Spirit of New Hopes and New Ideals. Teach them that God does not send sickness, sorrow, and misery, does not make wars, does not seek the death of a tiny child, does not send plagues, pestilences, etc. Teach them that God is Love, and that man's downfall and lack of ability to do right has brought about all the misery in the world. Children used to die through adulterated milk, adulterated by man, not God. Slums are made and permitted to remain by man, not God. A girl's life is dishonoured by man, not God. Children are cruelly treated by man, not God.

The "Knowledge of God" is the only remedy that will secure us that "Peace which the world cannot bring"—that inward peace which creates hopes and ideals to be lived up to, not only believed in; hopes and ideals which ever push one upwards with the desire to take others up too. Thoughts with action

—not thoughts without action. Christ said, “Seek and ye shall find,” but how many seek or understand what to seek? “Knock and it shall be opened unto you,” but how many knock? Seek ye first the “Kingdom of God,” and all these things shall be added unto you, but how many seek wealth and position first, and God last? Teach them to seek God first, and if during the next three months we all worked as hard as we could during work hours, and then for an hour a day looked within ourselves and sought God, trying to work out His wonderful scheme of perfection, what great strides we should make.

Capital sweated Labour previously (unfair), and now Labour is sweating Capital (unfair). Let Capital and Labour work properly together, every one doing their best, not taking mean advantages of each other, and then bit by bit, day by day, year by year, we shall find strife at home and abroad getting lesser and lesser, and each will gradually learn to trust the other. Let every one try and do away with all wrong deeds, so that right only can prevail, and then will begin to come the real New World towards which we are all keen to progress.—Yours very truly,

DAISY VASHTI HOBBS.

7, Lynton Road, Kilburn, N.W., Aug. 23.

WANTED, A LEADER

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Many of your readers must have read with more than usual interest the article of Dean Inge in yesterday's issue, and your leader thereon. There

are few thoughtful men who have not shared the Dean's perplexities, and who have not again and yet again in the recent months as they looked around on the world chaos that meets the eye on all sides, asked the anxious question: "Whither do these things tend?" It would seem as though the war had set in motion a social and political avalanche. A condition of equilibrium must ultimately be reached, but what then is to be the order under which we shall live?

The Dean surveys a wide field. I shall content myself with that more immediately around us. The outlook there is dark enough, the indications at the moment warn us to prepare for something darker, but I believe that in spite of temporary or apparent set-backs, organised humanity in our day as in all others is surely, if slowly, painfully and tortuously, working its way to higher levels and better things. Human nature in the individual is pretty much what it has always been. A healthy infant, irrespective of its origin, becomes mainly what its environment makes it—a more or less potent factor for good or evil. "Human nature—inhuman nature," in the sense the Dean intends, are incipient in each one of us: and if there is any one quality in the individual or class which has to be reckoned with in holding the balance between it and the community, it is self-interest.

Each loves himself and his own best. It has always been so—abnormalities apart; it is a law of Nature, and as such must be reckoned with. When unregulated it leads to self-aggrandisement, unabashed. It was this primitive instinct which in past generations

so frequently led to the remorseless grinding of the lower orders when as yet the arm of the law could afford them but inadequate protection. In our own day we are witnessing the opposite phase in the extortionate demands of sections of the labouring classes, who have come to a knowledge of their power of throwing the machine of State out of gear, and of thereby, as they hope, imposing their will on the community. The time seems ripe and the need urgent for a retelling of the apologue of Menenius Agrippa, for inculcating its wisdom till all sections of the community recognise the cardinal fact that no section can prey on the body politic without making themselves, as well as their country, the poorer for it. Nothing short of this will save us; but from whom will our Plebs hear and learn such a lesson? We need not be unduly surprised if to the working class such a principle does not commend itself. The wage-earners, by throwing down the gauntlet to their employers, have repeatedly gained better terms for themselves, terms which they may have felt should have been granted without a contest. From such trials of strength they come, suspicious of and hostile to capital, with hopes of greater victories. The need is urgent that the working classes should realise that in the path on which they have set out there comes a stage at which they are fighting their own interest, and that they cannot indefinitely pursue the policy of calling upon the State to stand and deliver without involving the country and themselves in a common disaster. Who is qualified to expound to them the fable of Agrippa?

He fails to read the signs of the times who doubts

that in the near future the Labour party must wield a great, perhaps a predominating, power in the State. If so, one of the most urgent political necessities of the moment is the need of a wise and great leader for that section of the community. Given a leader, clear-sighted and fearless, whose devotion to party has not prevented patriotism—a leader who (conscious of his followers' limitations and eager to amend them) does not fear to place the general good above class interest, to preach the doctrine of an honest day's work for a fair day's wage, and to inculcate the need of working for party ends by constitutional means—given such a man, I believe he will rally all that is sanest and best in the party of Labour to his banner. For such a leader, if he can be found, a great and patriotic duty awaits.

W. J. C.

CHURCHES AND LABOUR

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—A return to what we know as the old world is not possible. When the value of every man as a soldier, whatever his social status, was found about equal the foundations of a new order of society were laid, and a redistribution of the proceeds of industry an inevitable demand. That better Labour conditions are not incompatible with the recognition of the rights of Capital (which in reality is the product of former labour, and provides the tools for present labourers) is certain. The danger is that the fallacy of the bottomless pocket is not yet apprehended, and it seems as if vast suffering and widespread

unemployment, as the result of demands that trades cannot support, will alone teach that there are limits. That the demands are getting beyond reason is mainly due to the ease with which concessions were obtained during the war by those who took no actual part in its terrors.

The Church, as shown by the recent conference of bishops, recognises that it is faced with a new world, but the extent to which the repudiation of tradition and dogma has taken place in the intelligence of the average man or woman is still not apprehended.

The helplessness of Christianity and Established Churches in the terrible years of the war was astonishing even to those who have most lost faith in their power to influence character and conduct. Labour also has justification for regarding the Church as supporting class distinction, and the deference to social superiority which will be obsolete in the new world now in the making. The ecclesiastical endeavour to reconcile its traditions with modern tendencies and enlightenment must fail. What is the plain answer about the Bible? Is it the Word of God—and so infallible—or do the Churches now admit we know nothing about “the Word of God” and that the Scriptures are of human origin? Is the definite statement of St. Paul excluding women from the services of the Church canonical and binding? Apparently not, as deaconesses with authority to preach are to be admitted. That woman have equal capacity and higher spiritual qualifications may be admitted, but where is the adaptability of the sacred writings to the convenience of the times to stop?

The faith of the nineteenth century is impossible

to those who have studied the histories of religions and creeds—"the higher criticism" and the advances of science—but the need and practicability of a much nearer approach to Christian ideals as a rule of daily life would be accepted by "Agnostics," who feel there is some intelligence behind the Cosmos which, as Matthew Arnold said, "makes for righteousness," but of which, if we are honest, we have to admit we know little or nothing. The limitations of human knowledge, even though its borders are extended by a grudging recognition of the truth of some of the phenomena of spiritualism and the inutility of speculation which involves a "God" whose "cause" is beyond mortal mind to conceive, will have to be recognised in the new world which is in troubled birth under the eyes of this generation.—Yours, etc.

A NO-CHURCH CHRISTIAN.

Aug. 24, 1920.

THE ANCIENT WISDOM

BY LUCAS MALET

IN reply to this question is it permitted to ask another, namely, do we not habitually ask too much of events, of revelations, and catastrophes alike? In our natural craving for stability, security, for some anchorage in which mind and soul can rest, do we not drag at and stretch the poor things until the fabric of them splits, and—if a mixed metaphor may be forgiven me—we fall through the hole our impatience has torn in them into quite superfluous pits of angry despair?

The cry of a New World, for a New World, echoes for ever down the corridors of history. It, and the intoxicating promise of it, has been in the mouth of every conqueror, from Alexander to Attila, from Roman Cæsar to Corsican Bonaparte, and—where religious and secular interests meet—from Mahomet the prophet to Mannix the, just now, extremely inconvenient antipodean archbishop. Desire of a New World and hope for it has supplied the motive power of every revolution in every age and every country. In idea, it stood behind the excesses of the eighteenth-century Paris mob, as it stands to-day behind the atrocities of the Russian Bolsheviks. Essentially it is neither insincere nor ignoble. Whether issuing from a single mind, or the collective mind of

a multitude, it represents a recognition of imperfection and craving for betterment—in its initial stage, at all events. Nevertheless, it is in fact the worship of Maia, of illusion, a worship which has cost, and still is costing, humanity millions of lives and oceans of blood.

Though never quite enough lives, never quite enough blood. For successfully to obliterate the Old World and call a new one into existence you must extirpate and exterminate more thoroughly than the most ruthless conqueror, the most impassioned idealist—the two have curiously much in common—has ever had sufficient moral or animal courage to extirpate and exterminate yet. Before the end was attained each, in turn, has grown weary in this singular form of well-doing. Pity crept in, or satiety, or frank disgust. The task proved too great.

It is possible to go a step further, and—returning for the moment to the ingenuously literal biblical interpretations of our youth—to suggest that in this particular brand of courage, Divine Providence itself is somewhat deficient. For when, the perversities of mankind smelling a little over-rank, it seemed well to High Heaven that offending earth should be cleansed by a flood, mercy stayed the hand of justice, or rather of logic, inasmuch as it granted one apparently respectable family means of escape. This, in respect of any production of a New World proved a fatal, if an amiable, mistake. For, alas! the family in question was already tainted, as the sequel lamentably demonstrates. Going on board the Ark, certain members of it carried the germs of former corruption along with them, which germs—notwithstanding

solemn ceremonies of thanksgiving and self-dedication when that astonishing craft went aground on Mount Ararat—presently developed objectionable activity. Is it not recorded how the patriarch Noah so far forgot himself as to get most exceedingly drunk, while his second son—— But concerning that primitive scandal modern propriety counsels reticence.

TIME TO TAKE BREATH

Suffice it, then, to submit that Scripture itself forces home the conclusion that, so long as a single fertile human couple remains in possession here upon earth, the same world that we know, and that history so long has known, will remain, not only potentially but substantially in possession also. If we are resolved to have a new one, we must spare neither ourselves nor others, but make a clean sweep—thus and thus only can we secure our object, the human race in its entirety being dead. From whence common-sense would seem to derive the further conclusion, that Divine Providence, High Heaven—call the eternal, the final, and ineffable mystery by what name you will—is not particularly keen on the production of a New World; and that the agreeable story of Noah and his Ark is, not impossibly, designed to teach us the inherent futility of crying out for, or trying ourselves to create one by means of deluges, whether aqueous or sanguinary, local or universal—by deluges, in fine, of any description or sort.

And if this, to would-be conquerors, to idealists, and extremists, is an exasperating pronouncement, to average sober-minded persons—of whom the large

majority of our fellow-countrymen and women does, thank goodness, still consist—it is one of comfort. For it tends to restore confidence, and give time—sorely needed just now by most of us—in which to take breath.

After the amazements and dislocations of the last six years we badly want to get ourselves, and whatever of friendship and fortune is left to us, in some sort of mental perspective; want to arrange our notes on recent experiences, and cast up our accounts generally with fact. Towards acquisition of such inward equilibrium, the assurance that we are called upon to reckon, not with some new uncharted world, however big with millennial promise, but with a world wherein, though war-worn and distracted, we still find accustomed, time-honoured land and sea marks, must powerfully contribute. Extravagant though the shoutings of conflicting pioneers and prophets both small and great may be, the Ancient Wisdom is neither falsified nor silenced. Amid the raging of the peoples, the noisy downfall of thrones and of systems, it still subsists. These brutal convulsions, indeed, go in the main to confirm its verdicts. Truth is the same as ever, so are right and wrong, honour and dishonour. Above all, human nature is the same as ever in its manifold inconsistency, its magnificence and degradation, its delicious cleverness and piteous folly, its singular alacrity in running after strange flesh and strange gods.

Let this much be said for the encouragement of all sober-minded persons who desire space in which to take breath and get—to some extent—abreast of circumstance, before embarking upon further adven-

tures or throwing in their lot with any one of the opposing camps.

LOVE OF LIBERTY

The foundations are unshaken. There is no break in historic or moral continuity any more than there is a break in the rotation of the seasons, the regular coming of day and night. The last six years have produced nothing, revealed nothing, the possibility of which has not been actually in existence since the beginning of time. But, just as any great natural upheaval sets free imprisoned vapours and brings fresh soil, fresh surfaces to light, so in the human sphere does the upheaval of war; with the consequence that modifications and adjustments, many and, in direction, uncertain, of necessity result. Every relation in every class is slightly shifted. Political and economic values are affected. In no department of private or social life is pressure unfelt. Also many heretofore buried or half-buried fools, faddists, fanatics, are brought to the top. The sound of them goes forth on the four winds of heaven to the four corners of the earth—for a little while. It cannot be otherwise. It is not the first time these things have happened. It is wholly improbable that it will be the last. Let us, therefore, refuse to force any hasty climax, even in respect of fool-silencing; but give the present highly experimental conditions opportunity to settle down, to wear themselves out.

And this with the greater confidence, in as far as our own country and Empire is concerned, because, against the obscene and monstrous background of

war, one fact stands out in clear and very beautiful relief—the fact that the English race is neither degenerate nor effete, that its spirit is unbroken, its conscience sensitive, actively ready to affront momentous decisions and accept incalculable risks. We are over fond of trumpeting our congenital ineptitudes, of advertising our not infrequent blunders and mistakes. For once let us agree to sound a less self-depreciatory note and declare that, as nations go, for sanity and cleanliness our own by no means figures at the bottom of the list.

In this connection, since how to heal the wounds of the Old World—the only world we have had or ever shall have here upon earth—rather than how to rock the cradle of a new one, would appear to be the question at issue, mention may be made of our possession of one specially useful asset. We love liberty, honest, practical, even stupid personal liberty. May this continue, continue all the more because democracy has come to stay—for the next few score years in any case. Tyranny, a tyranny of ideas, a blind faith in systems—notwithstanding the telling object-lessons under this head so liberally afforded us, first by Imperial Germany and now by Soviet Russia—would appear to constitute the peculiar danger of modern democracies. At heart they are very young, afraid of themselves, afraid of humanity and hence nervously anxious to shackle it. “The Sabbath is made for man, not man for the Sabbath.” However good the cause, the form of government, the institution or State, it becomes evil, a thing to be repudiated and cast out, when it, rather than the individual liberty of its members—and the individual responsi-

bility which goes with such liberty—becomes the object of man's worship and faith.

THE PERENNIAL CONTROVERSY

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The atmosphere has been electrified during the past few months in consequence of the Romanes Lecture delivered by the Dean of St. Paul's, and the thunder has been echoed and re-echoed from the churches and the clouds, so much so that the Clerks of the Weather in Fleet Street, in gauging the climatic conditions of public opinion, have been more than sorely perplexed by the persistency of the effects.

Sir Ray Lankester, in reviewing Professor J. B. Bury's "History of Progress" in a recent number of *Nature*, deals with the same topic in a scientific light. For Lord Acton's successor at Cambridge has also done much, perhaps, to maintain the oscillations of discourse in rapid vibration. Whether we are making progress or not at the present time is an open question. But, as Sir Ray Lankester points out, there is not the slightest doubt that the human race has done so in the past, and I feel sure it is doing so and will continue to do so in the future. But we must think in æons in such matters. During the last 500,000 years man has unquestionably developed from the anthropoid ape to the civilised, cultured, intellectual, and scientific servant of Nature's laws, the master of himself and her resources. But the perennial controversy as to whether the influence of his environment, so far as civilisation and education are concerned, has altered his innate character

and hereditary qualities rages once again, as the meeting of the British Association at Cardiff attests.

Educational, like all acquired characteristics, are not transmitted. And the child of the civilised man of to-day, if brought up in the wild state of Nature, would be as barbarous in his instincts as any savage. To our sorrow, indeed, the past few years have proved that this is true even of some civilised races when the constraints of the ordered state of society are removed. Nevertheless there can be no doubt that civilisation on the whole is tending to eliminate the worst types, and though the process be slow, and necessarily slow, the movement on the whole is upward, for the utterly unfit for the environment which civilisation has created must gradually be sifted out. Though degeneration—so far as grappling single-handed with the crude forces of Nature—may to some extent ensue, the social instincts and amenability to civilised conditions are factors that as a matter of necessity must result, unless some great upheaval wrecks the fabric of society. Lessons from history during the comparatively short range of historically recorded time teach little. And generalisations based upon them are as dangerous as they are unscientific. The student of sociology must bear in mind the limitations of his knowledge, for it proves far too little in such matters.

But whether, as Dean Inge maintains, religion based upon the "Sermon on the Mount," which has done so much to spread the ethical principles of Christianity, though derived as they have largely been from the religions of the East, can serve to guide the onward march of human progress towards

ideal perfection, much will depend upon the utility of its doctrines. The exhortations to sell all and give it to the poor have long since been disregarded, even by those who admit and admire the perfection of its precepts. Example is in fact the best guide and counsel of perfection. There are no doubt still some well-meaning, pious, and self-sacrificing monks who persevere in the practice of their precepts. But celibacy has robbed, and is robbing, the human race of countless such types of the ideal Christian character.

To-day we can only hope for the progress of mankind towards ideal perfection, in his adjustment to his environment, and in the creation of an environment intended to elevate his mind and character in this direction. Education based on accurate knowledge and veracity, with that respect that is due to our fellow-men, will tend to eliminate in time those unfitted to civilised surroundings; and to lift men, and women too, to the true ideals embodied in the Service of Humanity; the Religion of Self-Sacrifice, through the Spirit of Love, for our fellow-men; and the unbending veneration of Truth, as inculcated by Science.

In this they will follow Christ in the very essence of His teaching on the Mount; or be cast out, even in this world, into utter darkness. For, as the pariahs of the civilised State seek vengeance upon it, so will they be suppressed. This is the sole guarantee of progress amongst us. But it must necessarily be an extremely slow process; not slower perhaps than that which has witnessed the Evolution of Man to his present state; and more rapid, I am

sure, than some of us imagine it to be.—Faithfully yours,

JOHN BUTLER BURKE, M.A.

Royal Societies Club, St. James's Street, S.W.

THE CONSISTENT PESSIMIST

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Dean Inge's article will no doubt arouse much interest and much correspondence, partly because of the vastness of the issues discussed, partly because of the dean's position and reputation, and partly also because of his truly monumental pessimism. The first point renders discussion almost impossible, and any hope of a satisfying conclusion futile. The second is too personal a matter to bear public discussion, but the third, assuming tacitly the second, is free from the same difficulties. We are all either optimists or pessimists at times, but happily few are such persistent, or shall I say, consistent, pessimists as the eminent Dean of St. Paul's.

In studying the causes, the history, and the immediate effects of the Great War, we are far too close to the events to be able to obtain the necessary perspective, "we cannot see the wood for the trees," and no human judgment arrived at under present circumstances can be relied upon, certainly not that of one who describes humanity as always marching in a vicious circle. Of course, if we only study the superficial aspect of things we shall see that nations, like human units, are born, live, and die, and thus may be said to "march in a vicious circle," but Dean

Inge is not referring to either units or nations, but to humanity, and his study of history, both human and natural, must have been very superficial for him to describe the progress of any living community or species as a circle. The history of all forms of life is the story of a vast evolution, the term "growth" being merely the same term applied to the unit life. Now all life is a struggle, and the life which is not a struggle is not worth living either to the unit concerned or to his "environment," but if we are constantly grouching at having a share in the struggle we are only making life more difficult, not only for ourselves, but for others. The worthy dean is quite at liberty to be a pessimist, but not in public. We have all got our own share of trouble just now, and we look to the dignitaries of the Church to relieve our troubles as far as possible, and not to burden us with difficulties we are powerless to prevent or overcome.

The Dean should also be careful to avoid overstating his case. Happily we are not all burdened with good securities which have depreciated in value; most of us are earning a living, and have secured some increase of income to meet the increased cost of living, and, more happily still, those who have not done this are not disposed to "write to the paper about it," but prefer to bear their burden in silence and hopefulness. If the Dean would emulate the example of his Master and mine, he would strive to bear the burdens of others, and not to increase them, he would not only exercise faith himself but recognise the faith of others who are at least striving to help the struggling world upwards. Humanity is indeed progressing rapidly,

but when climbing a ladder it is very dangerous—to most of us fatal—to look down, and in spite of the Dean, humanity is struggling upwards. Although it cannot see where it is going to, nor, without danger, realise the height it has already attained, it is slowly mounting higher and higher, it is gradually evolving towards the unseen, unknown ideal, and not all the pessimists in the world can delay its progress. All they can do is to make the progress more painful, more disappointing. The war has done something in forcing us to discuss a League of Nations, and possibly before another great war is possible we shall have realised that the true ideal is a League of Humanity.

The Church, of which Dean Inge is so distinguished an ornament, has, at last, begun to see that true religion is not represented by rigid, unreasoning adherence to a particular creed or form of worship, but in following in the footsteps of Him who was called "The Son of Man." The recent Lambeth Conference and all that it involved, as to the importance of which the Dean should surely be better able to judge than any one else, marks a stage in our progress, for when churches as well as nations begin to work for humanity and not for themselves, the world must become a better place to live in, and human evolution must progress more rapidly than it has yet done.

No doubt many will have to face disillusionment, certainly the manual workers will sooner or later have to learn that neither humanity at large, nor any section of it, can progress by selfishness. Every unit-life, as every section, community, class, or

nation, can find happiness and prosperity only by serving others, and even Dean Inge must admit that, in a world where selfishness, almost without exception, reacts first and worst against the self-seeker, things cannot be quite as hopeless as he appears to think. The spiritual forces which might (and will) regenerate society are indeed living forces and must therefore grow stronger day by day, but the Dean is not helping humanity by discounting all the visible evidences of these forces. If he opens his eyes a little wider, he may perhaps see some "clear signs of a spiritual awakening," but he will see little of this if he "turns his eyes only to the outwardly religious" and fails to notice "the unconventional religion," which, as he admits, "is not inclined to advertise itself." After all, our Divine Master was essentially "unconventional" and invariably escaped to solitude when His popularity was approaching the limits of "advertisement," and more than all, He kept all pessimism and personal distress to Himself or a few of His most trusty disciples, and stands in history as the most Glorious Optimist that ever lived.—Yours, etc.,

DUM SPIRO, SPERO.

A NEW MAGNA CHARTA

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Dean Inge, in his fearless, clear, and unmatchable diagnosis, has touched one of the weakest spots in the present-day life of the world. Here in Great Britain we must seriously recognise that our country is overloaded with debt, and like a private

individual or a firm, we must strive hard and ceaselessly to reduce our indebtedness.

We need a new Magna Charta setting out that every business department of the State must be made to pay its way and show a profit. The Post Office, with the telegraph and telephone services, ought to make a good profit, and so ought the coal mines and the railways. No subsidies should be paid to them by the State. Municipal tramways, gas works, electrical undertakings—all should make a profit; on no account should they become a charge on the rates. In short, all subsidies from the Imperial Exchequer and the public rates should be done away with. There are certain administrative departments which are the "trade expenses" of the nation, and in these there must be drastic retrenchment if the nation is to get a good balance-sheet.

In the matter of education, it would be far better if the parents, according to their means, had to pay for their children's schooling. Free education should be abolished now that working men are earning more than the so-called middle classes. A man earning £3 per week should pay 3*d.* for each child; if earning £4, then 4*d.* for each child; if earning £5, at least 5*d.* per week for each child; if £300 per year it would be 6*d.* per child per week. No one getting £350 per year should be allowed to send his child to an elementary school. Half the education of the country should be paid by the parents of the 6,000,000 school-children, and the other half could be provided by the State. It is quite certain that the new Fisher Education Act, if enforced in its entirety, will be a huge burden too heavy for the nation to carry. Income-tax

should be paid honestly and fairly by every one at its source. Weekly wage-earners should pay by income-tax stamps obtainable at any post office. Monthly salaries should be treated in the same way. Each man or woman, whatever his or her position, should have a deduction made of, say, $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. (or 6*d.* in the pound) when wages or salaries are paid.

The transcending question of the day is, "How can we pay our way?"—Yours faithfully,

A CITY MAN.

THE GOSPEL OF WORK

BY RENÉ DOUMIC

(Member of the French Academy, Editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.)

I AM requested to take part in the discussion of the serious problem : " Is it a New World ? " I do so all the more willingly because I have some very clear opinions on this subject—opinions which are those of the immense majority of Frenchmen. It is my conviction that I can bring to this discussion what may be called the French point of view. I deal successively with each of the questions proposed to me, the first dealing with the future of international relations. The map of Europe has been profoundly altered; satisfaction has been given to the principle of nationalities; the League of Nations has been constituted to watch over the maintenance of peace. May we hope, then, that the era of wars is definitively closed, that arbitration will replace violence, and that humanity will at last enjoy the reign of universal peace ?

That is the dream with which we deluded ourselves in the month of August 1914. Those of us who professed anti-militarism, and who, in face of the German aggression, rediscovered in themselves all the warlike virtues of the race, declared that it would be the last war, and that if they marched it

would be for the purpose of making "war upon war." I fancy that not one of them would use the same language to-day. They would avow, quite simply, that they went to defend their attacked country. As for war, shall we some day find the means of killing it? That is not certain. But it is certain that the means has not yet been found. The proof of this is that since the armistice was signed, and since the signature of the armistice was followed by the signature of the Peace, there has been no cessation of fighting. The Russians have had a revolution; they have assassinated the Tsar and his family, and laid down their arms in the presence of the enemies of their country, so as not to make war any more; and yet at the present moment they are making war against the Poles and are even being beaten by the Poles. War in Poland; war in Southern Russia; war in Syria; war in Persia, and in a dozen other places! And how many barely extinguished fires show signs of re-kindling! No; war is not dead; it is faced, indeed, by new prospects.

SOURCE OF FUTURE TROUBLE

For the alteration of the map of Europe was accomplished in the sense of justice and the inprescriptible rights of the races. That is quite as it should be, and one can only applaud the achievement. But, while rejoicing at the birth, or at the rebirth, of these small nations, one must not forget that the divergence of their interests will be a perpetual source of disputes. It will be to the interest of somebody that these disputes should lead to wars,

and that the fire should spread all over Europe. That somebody, who remains for to-morrow, as he was yesterday, the enemy—is Germany. Germany has been vanquished, but she has not been suppressed, not even divided. She has not abated a jot of her ambitions; she has only added to them a desire for revenge. Germany possesses a tenacious rancour and a patient hate. After Jena, she spent sixty-four years in preparing for Sedan. To-day she regards her defeat of 1918 as a mere episode in a struggle which she is continuing, and in which she hopes some day to gain the advantage. It is for us to understand this and keep on our guard. Germany anticipates divisions among the Allies. It is for the Allies to understand that their close and infrangible union is the sole means they have of preparing a better future for Europe and the universe.

The world upon which we are entering will resemble the old one in the sense that the plague of war will continue to be a permanent danger, and that the danger will be all the worse for those who believe themselves to be sufficiently protected by the empty protocols and inoperative formulas of the League of Nations.

Has the political atmosphere been renewed? Among us Frenchmen, yes, without a doubt. The "sacred union," which was preached to us by eloquent voices, was not a mere phrase, and it has survived the war. I do not mean to say that there are no longer parties in France, and that on numerous questions there are not differences of ideas. That would be a pure absurdity. But, in the first place—and it was well seen at the legislative elections—

the struggles between parties are not characterised by the same bitterness as formerly; and, secondly, the necessity of subordinating all questions to the national interest has been understood.

POLITICAL WISDOM

Of this political wisdom, which, with us, is a progressive step due to the war, a striking example is afforded by the formidable check sustained at the last elections by the Socialist party, and its present effacement. At the beginning of the war it was announced that we were about to witness a vast increase in Socialism, and that with us, at any rate, the advent of the Socialist State was merely a question of days. That is one of the innumerable prophecies which have been falsified by facts. The Socialists, it is true, the day after the war came, believed their hour had arrived. They attempted to make a revolution. Their failure was complete. At the present moment they are without any influence in the direction of public affairs.

The reason for this is, in the first place, that the bourgeoisie has become aware of the necessity of defending itself. It has measured the ground which it has lost by its perpetual concessions. It has perceived the abyss, and has recovered itself. And then the rural inhabitant, who has given to the defence of the country far more of his blood than the workman, is no longer willing to allow the law to be made by the latter. Since the war many peasants have become small proprietors. That, as may be imagined, does not give them any taste for Communism.

Finally, the spectacle of the abominable regime of the Soviets has been a warning of which French common-sense has fully understood the significance. For us the Russian revolutionaries have played the same rôle as the drunken helots for the Spartans. They have torn the veils which covered the chimeras of the Utopians. They have dissipated the mists which enwrapped the theories of the preachers of the new gospel. Behind Socialism we have seen the apparition of retrograde and sanguinary barbarism. That has been for us the most useful, as also the most impressive, of the lessons of things. There is not a Frenchman worthy of the name who consents to enter into conversations with the Soviets. The fear of Bolshevism is, with us, the beginning of political wisdom.

As for private morality, one must not be misled by the spectacle of transitory and inevitable perturbations. It seems that there is too much dancing and a deficiency of dress at certain fashionable watering-places. That is quite possible. There is talk of a wave of idleness and a wave of pleasure passing over society. It has always been the same on the morrow of great public cataclysms. But it is only just to remark that the taste for pleasure affects only a small section of society. As for the wave of idleness, in order to perceive that it has not invaded everything, it is sufficient to see how the fields of France are cultivated and how the devastated regions are reviving.

THE GOSPEL OF WORK

Here, however, there is something new which will be of great importance for the future. The cost of living may diminish, but living will remain very dear, and, on the other hand, taxation will absorb a considerable part of revenues, and perhaps even of capital. For that reason it will no longer be possible, practically, for anybody to live without working. The idler, the "gentleman's son," the "petit rentier," and others of the same type are doomed to disappear. Hence, in the new society, there will be a redoubling of activity, of initiative, and of work, which are the best guarantees of moral probity and integrity.

One of the scourges from which we had suffered most before the war was anti-religious passion, sectarian folly, despicable anti-clericalism. Happily we have done with this shameful and senseless frenzy. In this matter the brotherhood of the trenches has been a great help to us. Seeing how the priests bore themselves on the field of battle caused many of the prejudices against them to disappear. So well did the *curés* wage their part of the war that nobody dreams now of the "war against the *curés*." And then, in the moment of danger, souls naturally raise themselves to God. So often has death knocked at the door, so many hearts have been shattered by grief, that many of those who in time of peace were, to say the least, indifferent, have turned towards the Church, demanding its teachings and its consolations.

Summing the matter up, to the question "Are

we entering upon a new world?" I reply, categorically:

No! The war has created nothing new. It has only recalled and brought into light again a certain number of truths which belong to all time but had been forgotten. It has reminded the pacifists, those who believed a European war to be impossible, that the history of humanity is a perpetual recommencement and that war is a part of it and will never be eliminated, just as envy, hatred, and malice will never be rooted out of the heart of man. It has reminded the citizens of one country of the necessity, first and foremost, of uniting against the external enemy, and that one idea—that of the native land—must take precedence of all others. It has reminded individuals that to the law of labour, being of Divine institution, there can be no exception. It has reminded the unbelievers that human considerations do not suffice for satisfying the aspirations of the soul and that the category of the infinite cannot be eliminated.

This recalling of the great truths which have at all times imposed themselves on the life of the peoples is incontestably one of the benefits due to the war. Whether we profit by it or not for the future of humanity depends upon ourselves. It is a part of our duty to set the course for this future in one direction or another, according as we are or are not brave, willing, and patient in peace, as we were during the war. The future will be what we make it. It will be a progress so long as we do not forget the lessons of the war. It will be a retrogression if we cowardly yield to the threats of barbarism, whatever

the form of that barbarism may be. The whole truth of the matter is contained in the words of President Poincaré, who said that the peace would be in itself neither good nor bad, but that it would result from our efforts, as well as from our faults, and that it would be a "continual creation."

AN APPEAL TO MORALITY

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—I think there can be nobody, professing Christian or otherwise, who has troubled to devote any thought to modern problems but will find himself in the fullest agreement with Dean Inge's statement that if the world would give the Gospel of Christ a fair trial all would yet be well. The difficulty is to get that fair trial. Although it is true that the system of Government and the laws of a people are a reflection of their morality in that they would not concur in legislation or conditions which too grossly offended their sense of justice, it is equally true that the conditions into which men are born and in which they are brought up do, very materially, mould their morality. The ordinary man does not scrutinise very closely his traditional code, and, if there is any injustice accepted without murmur or even with approval by his neighbours, the odds are that he will acquiesce in it without noticing anything wrong. The evil of this is twofold: firstly, the continued existence of the injustice, and secondly, the blunting of the moral susceptibilities of those who accept it as part of the order of things. Two

ways of attaining our ideal would therefore seem to be open to us : to attack bad conditions by an appeal to morality, and to try to raise morality by improving conditions.

Since its beginning, the Church's activities have mainly been on the lines of the first of these methods, but the extent of its achievement seems to be that, while the Gospel message has been saved from complete oblivion, it is now if anything farther from getting the Gospel adopted as a working policy than ever. The second method has barely been tried. Certainly, numerous reforms have taken place when an injustice became too glaring, but they have mainly been of the nature of symptomatic treatment, and a whole-hearted endeavour to seek for the root of the evil and eradicate it has never been made. Dean Inge rightly says that the economic situation must dominate all other problems, and any attempt to reach a higher morality by the improvement of conditions should therefore start with an examination of our economic system to see how far it is consonant with our own highest conception of justice.

Our present system is founded on the general and legal recognition of the payment of interest. An economic system which provided that every one's power of consumption was proportioned to his own production, if not the best conceivable, would still appeal far more strongly to our sense of justice than does our present system. Since a country as a whole cannot for long consume more than it produces, it follows that its power of consumption must balance its production. Power of consumption then can

only be given to a non-producer at the expense of the producers who would either have to work harder, at no benefit to themselves, to supply the extra production required to balance the extra power of consumption or, if no extra production took place so that the existing total had to be divided between producers and non-producers, would receive less for their share than when the latter did not exist. Now this is precisely the effect of interest. It allows certain people to consume without producing. It allows many more to consume more than they produce. It inevitably forces many people to produce more than they are allowed to consume.

“If any would not work, neither should he eat.” If interest were illegal and everybody were paid according to his production it would necessarily follow that each man’s past consumption added to his positive or negative power of consumption at any moment would balance his past production, than which, in the present state of our morals, it is difficult to imagine any fairer arrangement. It does not come within the scope of this letter to discuss the difficulties of making interest illegal. The argument is directed to showing that, even to the present-day sense of justice, it is wrong. If we recognise it to be wrong it is our duty, in face of whatever difficulty, to do away with it. By eliminating such evil as we know of we give our children a fairer birthright and enable them to press forward to the ideal unhampered by the shackles we have had to spend our time struggling to cast off.—I am, etc.,

S. Q.

A TOO DOGMATIC CHRISTIANITY?

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—You have earned the thanks of thousands of men in publishing the article written by Dean Inge and your leader on that article. It is a subject which is engaging the thoughts of many upon whom the life of the country chiefly depends, and who do not commonly talk much. In his clearness of view and foresight, the Dean is unanswerable, but what the thoughtful man is apt to miss in his writings is some suggestion, some help as to getting out of the slough of despond which he depicts. It seems fairly certain that the spiritual forces of which he speaks will eventually be the salvation of the nation, and one might fairly expect the Church to be in the forefront in producing and conserving those forces, interpreting the spirit of the Gospel, and teaching us how to apply it to the solution of the pressing problems of the day. But the fact is that the most vigorous spiritual forces of to-day lie outside the Church, and are working bravely and with faith, but without unity.

The Church seems to be absorbed in the contemplation of the past eighteen hundred years, and unaware of the future towards which the world is hurrying without her. It is the dogma of the Church and not the Gospel which she professes to preach which is depriving men of her leadership in the fight against materialism, and as far as the plain man can see, it is only dogma which stands in the way of the complete unification of Christianity about which there are such heart-searchings at present.

We have many lessons to learn. We must give to money its proper place. Until both Capital and Labour realise that, provided income is not reduced below a pretty low level, it has absolutely no permanent effect on happiness, this cut-throat fight will go on. It is plain for any one to see that the man with three hundred a year, living within his income, and employing his leisure wisely, has far more opportunities for happiness than the millionaire, whose only ambition seems to be to double the wealth he already possesses, and which turns to dust in his mouth as he gets it. I look forward hopefully to a continuation of the discussion of this subject in your columns.—Yours faithfully,

MARK MARTIN.

THE WORLD OF UNREST

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—As a working man and believer in the fairness of your paper, which I read every day, will you kindly allow me to comment on the world of unrest from the point of view of men who neither desire revolution nor “Red Terrorism,” but who nevertheless have the intelligence to understand what is wrong. For weeks past now you have been making a wholesale attack upon Labour; exposing the propagation of Bolshevism; denouncing Councils of Action, and warning the public of the plot to overthrow the British Constitution, but in no instance have you faithfully recorded why there is all this unrest; why Bolshevism is gripping hold of the workers; why

the Council of Action has received such a good reception; in short, why ordinary people are getting the feeling that revolution is inevitable.

Now, waiving for a moment the questions I wish to discuss, the outstanding thought in my mind is this : That the people who are in a position to prevent a revolution are, consciously or otherwise, inciting one. I refer to the people who keep the screw tightened on the high cost of living; who are compelling working-class families to herd like cattle in single rooms, while lavish hotels are being constructed for the rich; who will not make reasonable compromises in business circles, whereby all ex-Service men may obtain work, even though it would mean a reduction in dividends; and especially to those comfortably placed people who maintain a stoic disregard of all working-class affairs except when the cry of nationalisation or revolution comes their way. There is no need for me to make an historical survey of events since the Armistice. Few will deny that the spirit of sacrifice which germinated during the war has been a dying entity since, and that an orgy of unrestrained selfishness has set in. Workers, like myself, have watched the misuse of political power; the constant transferring of taxation on to the consumer, and the "digging in" process of men who alone have the power of saving the constitutional bridge for the legitimate advancement of the people.

The question, Sir, seems to be this : Is there a prospect of conditions being rapidly improved on a basis of conciliation and goodwill between all classes, or are our present administrators going to continue to be so one-sided in policy as to invite a working-class

uprising? This is not to acquit my own class of all charges of thoughtlessness and irresponsible behaviour, but it is to affirm on a standard of values the legitimacy of expecting the possessing classes to be more amenable to compromise. To attribute the revolutionary impulse to the influence of a few foreign Jews is to underrate the intelligence of the average working man, for reason and logic play a more important part in his actions than many people imagine. The urgent need is to turn the limelight on to the causes of the new social wants and then boldly to face the remedy without further recriminations of the sufferers. Human values are undergoing a change, and if the ruling classes would recognise this fact and adapt their better nature to the solving of problems involved we should have a Council of Action not driving for revolution, but for the happiness and well-being of all concerned.—Yours obediently,

WORKING MAN.

August 25.

RESORT TO REASON

BY THE RIGHT HON. G. N. BARNES, M.P.

I SHOULD say that it is a world between the old and the new. We have, for the moment, lost our anchorage. The world we have left behind was one of patient industry and increasing wealth, of confidence and faith in authority, and of an absence of fear of war. But it was marred by disparity of fortune and rudeness of manners.

There was a change, however, and, in many ways, an improvement before 1914. There was a growth in the social sense which recognised evils and anomalies, and was engaged in removing them. Even old institutions were being subjected to scrutiny, and people were beginning to question the why and wherefore of many things. There was a real desire to make orderly progress towards a new and better social order. The world, in fact, was in process of evolution towards that new and better order. If we had been allowed to go on, we should have been by now well on the way. But Powers and Principalities ordained otherwise, and we are now adrift. For the war has shaken all out of their old grooves, and left most in a state of nervous tension, which in itself is a danger to the peace. Most people are irritable and excited, frightened at shadows, and willing to believe any indictment of Governments on its mere postulation.

The world, in short, has been impatient and insurgent. Anything may happen because peoples have left the region of reason and restraint, and are hovering round the portals of passion and fanaticism. I should therefore pose a further question: Is it to be a better world? And the answer depends upon many things, but chiefly upon a co-operation of men and women of goodwill in the necessary work of reconstruction. There can be little done in the way of building a new world until there is a restoration of the patience and industry of the old, and until the best elements in all countries sink sectional differences for the common good.

RUSSIA'S EXAMPLE

There is one ominous fact which should always be borne in mind, and that is that man to-day has at his disposal weapons and agencies which, if not controlled by moral and spiritual forces, may be his undoing. At present they are being used, in the main, for purely materialistic purposes, and in that fact lies the world's danger. The "Materialistic conception of history" is being worked out before our eyes, and, so far, it has resulted in loss of life and liberty, and even of bread. The world has to choose if it will travel further along that road, or if it will turn to other and better ways and counsels. And upon its choice will depend whether materialistic science is to be a curse or a blessing to mankind—whether we are to lapse back to methods of barbarism or move forward to higher planes of life.

For there is another thing to be kept in mind.

The world cannot be tampered with with impunity. It is getting more sensitive and inter-dependent as its parts and interests get more interlocked. Urban populations grow in size as life becomes more than daily bread, but these populations depend for their very existence upon uninterrupted transport service and production of supplies; more complete organisation of labour has put new power into the hands of those who control, and sometimes can only visualise, sectional interests. In short, the world is getting more sensitive and easier to upset. Its equilibrium depends upon growth of fellow-feeling and sense of responsibility on the part of all those who in any degree control affairs. And I agree with Dean Inge that the outlook is not promising, because I fail to see that sense of fellow-feeling and responsibility on the part of many of those who to-day are wielding power among us. Peace is jeopardised by speech and action of a factional character, and sometimes by action contrary to signed bonds.

The ink had scarce been dry on the Paris Peace Treaty ere some of those who had most benefited thereby began to set it at naught. The smoke of battle had scarcely cleared ere the industries blazed out in class conflict in all the belligerent countries, and by such conflict lessened production at a time when it was all-important to make good war's ravages. And, worse than all, fanatical doctrinaires installed themselves into positions of power from which they have played with poor, frail human nature without moral scruple or bowels of compassion. Truly the pillars of the temple may be pulled about our ears unless there is resort to reason and restraint and regard

for right and justice. Class warfare can have but one end, and Russia shows what it will be.

NEED OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

The emergence of the better world depends upon the inauguration and maintenance of peace, and upon the spirit of peace between nations and classes. Any one who contributes to that peace is helping the coming of the new and better world, any who endanger the peace are enemies of their kind. The world we live in now must be restored economically, and the nations must resume peaceful exchange of goods. That is the first thing needed. The League of Nations should be helped into being, and should function in straightening out difficulties between nations. I agree with the Dean that the constitution of the League is not as it ought to be. I agree with him that its denial to some nationals of the right of movement which is conceded to others is wrong, and is contrary to the principles for which we professed to have waged the war.

But these things can be rectified. Japan has, in fact, already taken a long stride towards bringing her industrial conditions up to Western standards, and thereby, in part, destroyed the argument upon which denial of equal rights to Asiatics had been based. There are other defects in the constitution of the League, among which is, I believe, a weakness in the sanctions. I should like to see the League armed with some material forces on behalf of the world. But the proper policy in regard to the League is not to pine for perfection, but to make the best use of what

is at our disposal. I hope that the Assembly when it meets will take some decisive step towards securing world peace unless world peace has not already come before the Assembly meeting.

And, in our troubles closer at home, I can only express the hope that principles of mutuality will yet at the eleventh hour be applied, and the community thereby saved from the set-back which a miners' strike would involve. We need industrial peace no less than peace between the nations. And, as one who hails the advent of the better organisation of the workers of the world, yet I feel constrained to say to my fellow trade unionists that but little good can come of that better organisation unless it is guided and controlled with a spirit of fair play to the community of which trades unionists form but a part.

AN AGE OF MATERIALISM

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—As showing the need and a feeling that a new doctrine and world policy are needed, the fact of your opening your columns for its discussion is proof. It also shows an all-round and honest desire for real change, a better life, and a striving after the better way. Man seems groping blindly in the dark to build anew. Should this be so, if our standards had been built upon a good foundation, and is it not because they were not so built that the storm has blown them away and at present left us derelict? The tendency now is not to find the new and good foundation, but an effort to bolster up the old. While our credit is broken, while nations have

crumbled and fallen, men are trying and expecting to refix the old, but they can never succeed, for the time is surely past and we need a higher and better form. If it were not so all our agony of the past years were in vain, and we know from the standard of human progress that this will not be so.

What then can take the place of the old? We may find it by taking the lessons of the past centuries, their teachings and enlightenment, and applying them to our present needs. During the last 150 years we have had more revelations in science and philosophy than in centuries before—revelations that have increased our status a thousand-fold—yet in many ways they have been misapplied by man to base uses and ends. Learning, instead of leading men to higher and better aims and actions, has led them along so many by-paths that many have missed the conception of the whole in its truth and have split up into so many factions that one wonders which is right and true. Yet, as we know, there can be but one right and one truth, and that we have to find each one for himself. It is this moral upheaval that is now the cause of the trouble and unrest. A hundred years ago men were either yea or nay to Christianity, but now Christianity has given way in many good men to materialism and other isms that are vainly given to fill the blank. It is these that have been shattered and left us derelict. Materialism was the cause of the war, and now that it is over we are reaping our due reward. Materialism is shattered beyond repair. Yet we are still trying to build on this false foundation, each for himself, none for all. We see the effect in our national life when, after all our struggles, we have a

peace of which Dean Inge says, " We cannot seriously expect Germany and Austria to accept the peace which we have imposed upon them as a final and irrevocable settlement."

In our industrial life we still see the old cry of might is right. In the policy of our workmen, instead of duty and love of service, we have ca'canny and the smallest output for the greatest wage. What is nationalisation and standardisation carried to the extent they are to-day but the outcome of our materialism and a failure? Why do the miners want nationalisation except that they believe under that scheme they will obtain a better living? Why do the mineowners oppose it except they do not wish to lose the fruits of the industry of the miners. Theoretically nationalisation should be the feasible solution of the problem from to-day's standpoint but in actual practice it would mean (as put by the coalowners), " Nobody responsible for anything," and the remedy worse than the disease. This is so again because of the spirit in which it would be undertaken, under which each party would endeavour to obtain the best possible with the least return in endeavour and work. We are full of plans of standardisation, we count our armies by millions, the trade unions count their members by standard grades. Individuality is left out of account, and it is here these plans must fail in due course. The individuality of man is a natural law and fact, and standardise as you may, will break out in another direction. Our individuality is a precious prize to guard and cherish. This necessity of standardisation alone proves its falseness. The moment the trade unions depart from its standards to

individualise it would immediately break into its component parts and dissolve. It is only a necessary means to an end, and morally wrong.

Our materialism has brought to the front Socialism as a means of supplying our need, but already in the hour it is most needed does it fail to fill our wants and is broken. Where tried it has been found to be little better than the old, and this must be so. Firstly, if they accept office under the old order, they are able to do but little, as the basic order of gains and losses remains unaltered. Secondly, to change this they must drift to revolution. Again, the moral force condemns it, for it is the self of the proletariat versus the self of the governing class. And we see its expression all around us to-day. Socialism has been a necessary stepping-stone in the march of progress, enlightening the mind of the masses of mankind, leading them to the universal cry of brotherhood and showing them their power, but it is wanting in that moral force which will make for true success. In its stead must come a blending of the light of our experience. On the material side one hundred years ago man could do without railways. To-day the world could not exist without this necessity. The same applies to electricity and the other great scientific achievements. As man's need has arisen so have his wants been supplied. This is also the answer to Professor Bury's question of Malthusianism. If we had to look forward to the over-population of the world under our present material order the outlook would be dreary indeed. But we can already see the means of its salvation in our intensive culture and scientific feeding. On the moral side we have seen many

teachings and expansions of thought. One hundred years ago such teachings would have been naught but heresy and a cause of superstition and worse witchery. To-day, thanks to the scientific achievements of our age, we are in the main able to look at questions and accept them without falling so much into these errors. What has been done, however, is that portions of light granted to one and portions to another have been accepted by them as the full, and the many factions thus built up opposing each other is one of the root causes of the materialism of to-day.

Darwin is quite right; man has evolved, and our very question to-day is a question of evolution to the better life. Ernst Haeckel is right in his facts, but not his deduction that Cosmos is a vicious circle without cause or end. Even man does not make a chair to burn and waste, but to use. Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Conan Doyle are not preaching fresh doctrines, but making use of the enlightenment we are having vouchsafed us, and of which the facts should have been known 2000 years. Christian Scientists again are only teaching old-world truths in a new form. All are parts of the enlightenment of the age in the one great cause of man's onward march to his goal of life. Instead of friction, the wheat should be sifted from the chaff and blended into one beautiful doctrine of love, service, and truth. The true teaching is a blending of the old yet ever new Bible teachings, which are as true to-day as ever, on which our civilisation is built, with the enlarged vision these other teachings have given us of our life and destiny. Until we can get away from our materialism to this change of heart no other form can

save us. Either love of service and duty with honour must take the place of self and wealth for itself alone, or we shall drift to the materialism of Socialism and chaos in a welter of revolution. The idea of a social revolution without bloodshed is absurd and incapable of achievement. This spirit of love, service, and honour to be of use must come from the top downwards. It is useless expecting the mass of the people, who have not the enlightened view or the training, to be otherwise than they are taught and the example set them. It means that the old idea of 5 to 7 per cent. return on capital must go, and a man at the top be willing to serve as the man at the bottom for his fair return according to his capabilities and individuality. The gap between the rich and the mass of the poor was never so great as it is, even with the high wages. The possessing classes by reason of change in values have automatically had the value of their possessions increased three and four-fold at least, and while the non-possessing mass receive extra on the one article they produce, for everything they wish to possess they must pay this extra three and four-fold to possess. This can only under present conditions go on till breaking point is reached. This does not mean a sudden social revolution, but that those who have the means at their disposal and who really love and serve their God, shall come forward and provide the leaven of this spirit and service.

It can be done in other ways, but while retaining their individuality and control, these men would form a nucleus and example that would gradually permeate the whole. That these men do abound we have many examples in our public life, where

honour comes before wealth, and many of our rich men to-day are not rich for the sake of wealth, but their capabilities need this wealth for their working and the control it gives, and under our present system they must needs keep it for their own use, and squander the surplus. In Matthew, chap. xxii., we read : " Master, which is the great commandment of the law ? Jesus said unto him : ' Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.' This is the first and great commandment. The second is like unto it : ' Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." These words are as true to-day as when they were uttered, and all the experience of the past 2000 years has been but our working out and learning of this law till to-day we cry brotherhood, and even materialism would standardise for the greater good for the greatest number.—Yours faithfully,

H. E. FISHER.

Hill House, High Wycombe, Bucks, Aug. 25.

CHRISTIANITY AND ECONOMICS

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Dean Inge has propounded some very hard propositions, leading up to the most difficult of all, the race question. Sir Anthony Hope Hawkins points out that we must not " expect the new world to be born full-grown." Evolution, he indicates in effect, is the line along which the new world will gradually come, and to each generation of men it will always be

the old world, I think, for as it changes so we change with it, and consequently we do not realise that the "old" is always changing to the new. It is here at home that we of this country have to play our part to ensure that the gradual growth from "old" to "new" is for the better. The Dean thinks that we must pass through a period of political and moral bankruptcy. Perhaps, for the nation remains unaccountably blind to "the things that belong unto our peace," but the way to the new world stands clearly revealed if we would but lift up our eyes to behold it.

How hard we find it as a nation to do so, is well exemplified in Professor Bury's article, when he reminds us of the theories of Malthus, and drives them home by telling us that Mr. Knibbs predicts that if the present rate of increase in world population goes on for four centuries, there will not be enough food to go round.

Truly, "where there is no vision the people perish," and I know it is hard for our professors to clear their minds of pre-conceived ideas, and to realise that Christianity is the basis of economics, and that it is only when economics are divorced from Christianity that the theories of the Rev. Mr. Malthus are true. For the conclusion of the verse tells us "but he that keepeth the law, happy is he," and the economic law Christianity teaches us to keep is the simple Eighth Commandment, "Thou shalt not steal"—*i. e.* "Thou shalt not get without giving (the fair equivalent)."

Let our economic system be such as to make it increasingly difficult for each individual to fail to fulfil this law, by making it easy for other individuals

to refuse to "give" without "getting" the fair equivalent, and it will follow automatically that the same principle will apply in our relations with other races, of whatever colour they may be, and international amity will gradually take the place of international animosity and strife. Then the marvellous growth of international trade exchanges will ensure that an ever-increasing population will be fed with increasing ease, and Professor Bury may rest assured that while "seed-time and harvest" remain there will be foodstuff enough and to spare for the mouths to be filled. And lest he should think I am speaking without authority, let him study *The Science of Civilisation*, by the late C. B. Phipson (now out of print, but to be found in some public libraries), and he will learn how the nation is over-ripe for the reconciliation of its economics with Christianity, and the system by which this can (and must) be effected—no sharp change, but the natural result of our gradual evolution.—Yours, etc.,

MARK B. F. MAJOR.

Tudor Cottage, Duppas Hill Terrace, Croydon,
Aug. 25.

THE GOSPEL OF SELFISHNESS

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—No one with any recollection of life before the calamity of the recent dreadful war could for one moment believe that he or she has now entered into a new world, in the sense of a better or improved world. We are undoubtedly in an altered one, and

in one in which we see so much of what we valued and prized most gradually slipping away from our grasp and ken. The whole social cosmos of all continents has had a shock, and it is still suffering from tremor and nervousness, and we can see the various nations, and even individuals, looking at each other with some amount of nervous distrust and expectancy. Forces are let loose and have become dominant which were hitherto held in leash, and subdued by public opinion and by the social laws of "live and let live." There is a wave of social unrest which is rapidly becoming social insanity, in that in many aspects it is suicidal and demoralised, and its tendencies are to subvert and demolish all law and order and authority, with a contempt for the rights and needs of all members of the community, and a destruction of that peace and rest which the peoples require and cannot do without, in order to enable them to recover themselves and become again whole and strong. The two leading characteristic features of humanity at present in its altered state in the "new world" are, firstly, selfishness and, secondly, a mad craze for enjoyment and amusement. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Let us enjoy ourselves while we can, we may soon be beggars. What is the good of saving, or economy? The workman or the tax collector will have it, not us. Hence the extravagance, the lust for pleasure, the crowded restaurants and theatres and music-halls, and picture palaces, dances, dinners, golf, motors, betting, football, every possible thing that can enable people to rush about from place to place, from thing to thing, and to forget themselves for the time, at all cost for

the future. There is a pleasure mania, an extravagance mania, a lust for spending. It has pervaded all classes from the street gamin and kitchenmaid to the aristocrat, the plutocrat, and the Government bureaucrat.

What are the restraining influences of any value? Preachers are disregarded. The political economist may produce his laws and theories in vain endeavour to show the inevitable disaster ahead. The philosopher may inculcate the folly and desperation of such a life. The dean, the vicar, the *curé*, the pastor, may strain their earnest eloquence to bring people back to a sane and simple life, but it is of no avail. The country would be all the better for a dose of Cromwell and his Independents. There is too much liberty of thought and action. This liberty of thought is destroying the moral goodness of the youth of the generation; the liberty of action is enabling fools to do with impunity what they themselves wish and will, and to inflict untold misery and want on their fellow-creatures. There would seem to be only two possible hopes of cure. One would be the re-establishment of Christianity as a living thing, compelling people to more closely consider their neighbours and to cease to injure and ruin them. The other would be a strong centralised Government, which, by virtue of laws made for the purpose, and for the protection of society in general, should put down evildoers of all kinds and classes and put an end to their practices. "There has gone a glory from the world." The nation has lost much of its solidity of character and is rapidly losing its self-respect. Unless some such reconstruction of national character occurs we stand to lose all

that our sons and brothers fought for, and their lives will have been spent in vain—wasted. As the working people are the more numerous in the country, it is to them that this must mostly appeal. Let each one of them not only think but act for himself and not be gulled by others. And let him do so, not as a man whose life-interests depend upon picture palaces, betting, and football, but as a man who has a wife and children or mother and sisters dependent upon him, and to whom his whole duty belongs, and not to himself.

Let him realise that any act he contemplates in the way of striking, when he is already well off, which will inflict want and misery, even illness and death, upon others, will inevitably have results which he never contemplates, and will recoil on himself and his own. The only chance this country has of recovery is not the perpetual outbreak of fresh sores and new diseases, it is the quiet and rest of peace at home, necessary for everybody to work their hardest and best with an earnestness, to work off the war's worst after-effects. The man who is in danger of bankruptcy and failure from living beyond his means, if he thinks he has any chance at all of staving it off and keeping his business, immediately retrenches in all possible ways, cuts down expenses, and denies himself all pleasures and extravagances until he has done so, and moreover, and this is important, he works his hardest to increase his output and to get new business. Let the nation do that. Let the Government show the example by national economy and reduced expenditure. Let those who have money think of the moral sin of

wasting it, and let the working people feel it a crime to throw the nation back when it is making a bound to recover itself after its disasters. And, above all, let the working people recollect that if cheaper goods come from abroad, as they surely will, and as they did before the war, and that Germany, America, and Japan will willingly supply our market as they did before, and that every commodity placed cheaply before our people, if it captures the market here, will mean the loss of that commodity as an industry of this country. Let the miners put up the coal if they will, it will come cheaper from the Transvaal and other countries, and if we cannot buy it at home at a price we can afford, we must get it elsewhere. The same will apply to iron, steel, glass, soft goods, wearing apparel, all the necessities of life. And the British workman at the end of a series of carefully elaborated strikes may wake to find his occupation gone—to foreigners who have worked.—Yours faithfully,

SPECTATOR.

Aug. 26, 1920.

MEANING OF PROGRESS

BY W. L. COURTNEY

It is better to begin with current conceptions of Progress in dealing with a question like that which stands at the head of this paper. What are the ordinary notions on this subject? There is a general belief that history is a record of a steady though slow advance of humanity through different ages, that each age adds something to its predecessor, that by degrees, however tardy, the nature of man is gradually refined from primitive barbarism to what we mean by modern civilisation. Civilisation itself is held to be something which leads up to the final though distant goal of happiness and welfare. Assumptions of this kind are held to rest on experience, but if we analyse them their experimental basis is by no means secure. For instance, the history of civilisation is the record, roughly, of some 6000 years, and that is a very small space of time as compared with the life of the globe and of the solar system. To assume, because humanity for some 6000 years showed a steady advance in material respects, that therefore the same steady progress will continue for many times 6000 years is an unverifiable hypothesis. So, too, it is exceedingly doubtful how much is included under the word "progress." Progress may mean only change, quite as easily as it can mean betterment. That one age

changes in external aspects from another is, of course, an obvious truth; but it by no means follows that such a change is for the better. Indeed, many thinkers have solemnly proclaimed that it is for the worse. And what is the ultimate end or goal of these progressive movements? Is it the gradually attained felicity of mankind from the point of view of his material welfare, or is it an increase in those spiritual and ethical graces without which no such notion as that of human perfectibility could ever arise? From considerations of this kind it seems to follow that the doctrine of progress is not a scientific truth, capable of absolute demonstration, but an article rather of belief on the same plane of thought as the immortality of the soul or the idea of Providence. We accept without thinking or analysing this notion of progress; but when we have analysed it we discover that it includes elements which breed doubt and hesitation and which as a matter of fact have persuaded several philosophers to disbelieve in it altogether.

ANCIENT BELIEFS

Even as a philosophical theory it dawned very late. We all know that the view held in antiquity was by no means the same as that to which our minds are firmly wedded. Plato and the Greeks believed in a series of cycles—that is to say, that men go through progressive changes in a recognised order, and when the series is finished, begin over again, repeating their past experiences, though it may be under altered conditions. The great philosopher-poet of Rome, Lucretius, believed in similar fashion

in history as a circular process; and, indeed, our most recent experience lends some colour to a theory of this kind. A hundred years ago there was a great European convulsion, followed by ardent and idealistic dreams of peace and welfare, from which the world awoke to the discovery that "the more things change the more do they remain the same." We, too, have had our great European convulsion. Our young men and maidens have dreamed of a world in essence changed and improved, and once again we are discovering that many of our eager hopes have become liars. Nevertheless, the notion of cycles does not prevail in modern times, and thinkers, especially French philosophers, began in the sixteenth and later centuries to formulate in its place a theory of gradual advance. They went further than this; they tried to outline the law of this progress. And so we arrive at Auguste Comte, with his Law of the Three States, through which all human conceptions pass—the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. In the first stage men tried to explain the world-scene as due to the action of heavenly powers; in the next they replaced these heavenly powers by abstract qualities and generalisations; and in the third, or positive, stage—the only one which science acknowledges—they gave up the quest of ultimate laws and confined themselves to a study of phenomena, tracking out the relations of cause and effect, using hypotheses and the logical laws of induction to arrive at experimental truth, apart from windy and undemonstrable theory.

THE LAW OF EVOLUTION

To us, of course, in the modern world, the notion of human progress is mixed up with, and largely based on, the great law of evolution. If, as Herbert Spencer thinks, everything passes from a state of homogeneity to a state of heterogeneity, each cause producing a number of effects and increasing the complexity of our world, then at all events we have established an idea of steady, methodical advance, though even so we leave undetermined the ultimate goal, or whether the goal itself is one which humanity should desire. But directly we assume that one epoch of history arises out of the preceding epoch, and that so far from being a fresh birth of time the new epoch is based on conditions which prevailed in the antecedent age, we have reached one conclusion at all events of no little importance in the present inquiry. Is it a New World? we ask, and to that the answer in its simplest form is that a new world, a new age, a new epoch, is impossible. You cannot begin all over again in this absolute and categorical fashion, because everywhere you are hampered and surrounded with the results and effects of preceding events. One can see this most clearly in the case of an individual. He, too, undergoes change after change in the course of his development. But in no single instance is it possible for him to begin all over again. He is what his past years have made him, and, though it is in his power to modify some of the conditions, it is impossible to make a clear break with the past. It is one of the mistakes which were made by French thinkers in dealing with their great

Revolution. The politicians and theorists who were so active in 1789 believed it to be possible to start the world afresh on new lines. They thought they could have a *tabula rasa*, a clean slate, on which novel characters could be inscribed, and the past superseded and forgotten. The result in that case was, as we know, by no means so auspicious or so beneficial as the thinkers hoped it might be. Terrestrial happiness appeared to be promised when ugly old mediæval institutions were swept away; and humanity, purged of its old errors, seemed likely to enjoy a new heaven and a new earth in which dwelt external peace and internal contentment, the abolition of war, and the fraternisation of the various tribes of humanity. But the old tag of the Roman satirist still survives in all its bitter truth, that "you can expel nature with a pitchfork, but it will always return." Even if it were possible to destroy all the institutions, prejudices, and beliefs of a particular age, mankind will still answer to its old stimuli, and the selfishness which we hoped to have got rid of once and for ever will reappear in a thousand different forms. In the sense of a clear break with the past and the dawn of an utterly unprecedented order of things, there can be no such thing as a new world, and we shall only stultify ourselves and procure an endless amount of chagrin and disappointment if we act and think as though human perfectibility could be held within our grasp.

TASKS FOR THE FUTURE

What remains, however, is a much humbler but a much more useful task. After the tremendous

convulsion of the European war there are many things which experience ought to teach us to avoid, and many schemes of betterment that we can help to put into operation. Externally, of course, the world has changed a good deal in the last few years. We see it in the international sphere, where new nations have come to birth; we see it in the political sphere, where democracy has gained vast increases of strength; we see it in the social and economic sphere, in which indeed the outlook is melancholy enough, but where once more it is our duty to exercise national and individual economy, and by self-denial and unselfishness work steadily for the future. But we must not make the mistake of thinking because certain older institutions have either been swept away or are in process of being rebuilt that therefore we can act with an entire freedom from responsibility. Still less must we imagine that improvement of material conditions can have any particular effect on the moral and spiritual character of humanity. If civilisation means merely that we have many material advantages which our predecessors lacked, then indeed we can cheerfully assume that humanity has progressed in a fashion which is almost overwhelming in its volume and significance. But civilisation ought to mean something very different from this. It ought to signify that we have grown to be more tolerant, more helpful, more sympathetic in our dealings with one another; that nations have put aside their selfish aims and have agreed to live together in amity; and that Militarism has passed away as an ugly dream. The one keynote of the advance which humanity has made through all the ages is its

attitude towards liberty. Indeed, we cannot formulate any ideal more appropriate for us in existing circumstances than a resolute proclamation of the immense value of freedom. Freedom does not necessarily mean democracy, though democracy has been much interested in its development. But the peril to avoid is the gradual obliteration of the idea of liberty by a professed worship of equality, in which case, under Socialistic conditions, we shall indeed be exchanging an older kind of despotism for a modern and wholly relentless tyranny such as that sketched in the programmes of Lenin and Trotsky.

A NATION CRYING FOR GUIDANCE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Dean Inge, in your issue of August 23, draws a convincing picture of Humanity, having struck its tents, wandering without a track or a leader, not knowing whither it goeth. The old organisation, dependent upon stored reserves of material commodities, has emerged from the war bankrupt, and we are consuming its few remaining assets far faster than we are replacing them—our so-called reconstruction is merely the completion of the destructive process. There does not appear to be any new organisation capable of carrying on the work of civilisation; the League of Nations is to be encouraged, but Dean Inge—like most other watchers on the hill-tops—has evidently little faith in its ability to govern the world. The Dean, therefore, justifies his gloomy reputation inasmuch as he refuses to prophesy fair things to those who would

welcome the re-establishment of society on its firm pre-war basis of commercialism. He is at bottom no pessimist, for he believes that if the world would give the Gospel of Christ a fair trial all would yet be well, and he has recognised the dominant fact that the spirit of Christ is firmly planted in multitudes of our people who make no profession of Christianity; but it is true that pronouncements lose much of their force when they come from the lips of an ecclesiastic, whose enemies will retort that it is his business to say such things, and that his Church has offered little guidance to a nation crying for guidance.

But when in our search for a solution to this "Riddle of the Future" we turn from religion to science—not rejecting the solution offered by Dean Inge, but recognising that it will not be accepted in its present-day dress—we find that science, as represented by Professor Bury, is mainly concerned with negations. Professor Bury calls for liberty, that cardinal principle of Western civilisation, which has been omitted from Bolshevism and from all the other social experiments which theorists are eager to impose upon us. It is easy to agree in this demand, but it is merely negative. We are not told what we are to do with our liberty, and liberty *per se* is no more than the negation of that coercive discipline against which we all rebel, but without which few of us can live socially useful lives. The same criticism applies to Professor Bury's advocacy of the deliberate limitation of population. The universal acceptance and practice of Malthusian principles would amount to a successful repudiation of the competitive discipline imposed upon us by Nature; there is no reason to

suppose that it would give us any effective control of ourselves to replace Nature's roughly beneficent tyranny, but there is reason to believe that we should find ourselves in the grip of a tyrannous self-interest far more irksome than any economic discipline from which we suffer to-day. Malthusianism is useful as a protest against the vicious economic theories of a century ago, which taught that all that was necessary for social salvation was an unlimited supply of human material and ruthless competition; there is no danger of its universal acceptance before the achievement of a real discipline of ourselves by ourselves. As Professor Bury rather despairingly suggests, the hope of the future seems to lie in the scientific control of human conduct. Does experimental psychology hold the solution of our difficulties?

If we are expecting a scientific genius to come forward and lead the people by his expert advice to healthy ways of living, it is certain that we shall be disappointed. The sound advice might be forthcoming; it would certainly not be followed. Modern practical psychology is more concerned with the control of emotion than with logical argument; but emotion (as distinct from the expression of emotion) cannot be controlled except by consent; and the normal man or woman will refuse that consent, much preferring to be ruled by his or her own emotions. It is time for us to abandon the vain search for a heaven-sent leader, who will save us the trouble of thinking for ourselves. Democracy has wasted its energies thus since the day of its discovery that direct self-government of each man by himself is impossibly difficult. We have to face these facts—

that independent self-government is impossible, that discipline is essential, and that discipline arbitrarily applied to individuals from without will no longer be tolerated. How can we achieve a discipline at once effective and tolerable? Nature solved the same problem in the early days of life upon the earth, and it is to Nature herself, rather than to any scientist, that we should look for guidance. In those dim and shadowy days the progressive evolution of life found itself opposed by an apparently impassable barrier. The highest form of life upon the earth, a mass of cells in all not much bigger than a pin-head, was yet too large for internal efficiency; its cells were so numerous that they could not readily follow the lead of any one cell, yet for other reasons it was inadvisable to split up into smaller colonies of cells. Nature met the difficulty by separating the herd or mass of cells into two classes or sub-herds, one concerned with protection from external danger, the other with the absorption of food. Each sub-herd had its own habits and conventions and its own special work, but they had a common heredity and constitution, and each class was dependent upon the other for many of the necessities of life. The two classes of cells were thus kept in close contact and sympathy, and by their further growth and further specialisation have given us all the higher forms of life, including man himself.

Nature is to-day setting about the solution of a precisely parallel problem. Instead of material cells we have the invisible minds of men; instead of a mass of cells we have that community of minds which we call a people; the life to be controlled shows itself not in the clumsy movements of a soft

mass of cells, but in the emotions which determine the life of a people. And in place of Nature's old method of haphazard trial and failure, requiring thousands of years to reach a solution, we have Nature's new method of the avoidance of mistakes by the intelligent prevision of man, so that visible results can be achieved in a generation. But if this immense experiment of Nature is to be successful it must be carried out by the whole community of minds, who will be at once the experimenters and the material for the experiment; for it will involve a real modification of each mind, a change which can only come from within. It will, I think, be found that each individual can have complete freedom of action if he will put himself in so intimate a friendship with those better able to think clearly that his thought will naturally be influenced by them, or that he can have complete freedom of thought if he will take his standards of conduct from the more conventional men of action. Whichever he may choose, he will seem to surrender some of his independence; but his independence is at present very largely illusory, and in practice it will be found that the man who thus sacrifices himself will gain a measure of control over both himself and others far greater than he has enjoyed in his previous condition of alleged independence. There is urgent need to make a beginning. The many will follow, if there is a trodden track which they can see, when they are frightened by the clearly impending collapse of the social fabric, but probably not until then.—Yours, etc.,

J. NORMAN GLAISTER, M.B., B.S.

46, Weymouth Street, W.

OUR UNCHANGING LAWS

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Every cell in the human body is said to be renewed in the course of seven years, but we do not therefore say that a man is a new man after each septennial period of his life. Again, the whole population of the world is changed in the course of a generation (say every thirty or forty years), but this renewal of population does not constitute a new world. Similarly all human institutions have their periods of change, but the rate of such change varies enormously, so that at no given time can it be justly held that all human institutions are new.

Surely the fact is that the world is governed by laws that are not of human origin, and that whereas human conceptions of those laws change, the laws themselves do not change. In short, the world, though changing, can never be said to be a new world.—Yours faithfully,

H. EWART.

93, *Enys Road, Eastbourne*.

THE OLD ORDER CHANGETH

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—It seems almost unnecessary to answer the question, "Is it a New World?" The most casual observer should be able to read in the signs of the times that the old order changeth. As the leaves from the trees in a forest fall at their appointed time, so will those ordinances which have existed fall away

and give place to the new. They have been written by the same handwriting that has written all the laws of the natural world, and if He purposes who can annul? "He is not slack as some count slackness." Although in living and moving in this change it is hard to realise we are not individually taking part in the arrangements of this purpose, but we are no more doing it than the corpuscles in our bodies are directing the way in which we walk. The handwriting has been written on the wall long ages past. But as diseased parts in the body require special treatment to secure the safety and health of the whole, so does the Creator deal with peoples and nations over which He rules. "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform."—Yours truly,

KATE ABBOTT.

22, *Tweedy Road, Bromley, Kent.*

STUBBORN FAITH OF 1914

BY EMILE CAMMAERTS

THE problems raised by Dean Inge in his remarkable article published by the *Daily Telegraph* on August 23, seem to extend far beyond the frontiers of this country, and I therefore may hope that it will not be felt an intrusion if I venture to put my point of view before your readers.

Is there really such an extraordinary difference between the situation with which we are faced to-day and the situation which confronted us in August 1914? Have we to discard illusionary ideals before following new ones, or ought we not rather to build a new world on the strong foundations of the old, and would the difficulties against which we are contending to-day not be smoothed to a certain extent if we kept a clear understanding of the great aspirations which led us into the conflict, and, at least during the first years, sustained us through the ordeal? The fact that the "scrap of paper" and the fight of "right against might" made such excellent catch-words for recruiting and war propaganda generally, does not imply that there was nothing behind it. I know that this contention may seem very foolish to many, but if the 1914 attitude was an illusion it was at least an illusion shared by the best and most critical brains in every Allied country. This alone would be a suf-

ficient reason to induce us to reconsider the present situation in the light of past events.

It is quite true that if nationalism means the preservation of the integrity and the independence of one's country against an unprovoked attack, nationalism first of all brought us into the struggle. But it did not blind us to the danger of armed peace, and of the old system of balance of power in Europe. Indeed the very insistence with which public opinion dwelt upon the breach by Germany of international law, and on the necessity of rendering such a breach henceforth impossible, showed that the Allied people understood to a certain extent their responsibilities, and were determined to reform international institutions in such a way as to render such a breach, if not impossible, at least very difficult, and to be followed by prompt action. Such was the meaning of the formula so dear to the heart of many of our best soldiers—"the war to end all wars"—so that, when it came, the suggestion of the League of Nations only gave a concrete form to ideals already pervading the air.

It may very well be that, as Dean Inge suggests, the war was made by the leaders of Central Europe to combat social unrest, but whatever harm may have been caused by the doctrine of armed peace and by the grouping of European alliances, it seems evident that neither the action taken successively by France and Belgium nor that taken by England was prompted by similar motives. Any aggressive war would have been extremely unpopular in the Allied countries, and, instead of allaying social unrest, it would very likely have prompted it.

TOWARDS THE PAST

A rapid victory on the right side was the necessary condition for an easy and prompt settlement. The long delays and the general exhaustion of European resources are the main causes of our present trouble, since they bring, to a certain extent, into conflict the principles of nationalism and international consciousness which were so harmoniously combined at the beginning of hostilities. While an early peace might have expressed itself mainly in political and military terms, the wreckage wrought by years of foreign occupation and systematic devastation obliged the Allies to insist on a substantial—some say on a too substantial—indemnity. The economic future of such countries as Belgium and Northern France depends entirely on the conclusion of bargains which are, necessarily, of a rather sordid character. The general public has to decide between the contradictory reports of experts whom they are bound to trust blindly either one way or the other. The threat of international anarchy adds still to the confusion. Those who insist on the fulfilment of the Versailles clauses are accused of imperialism, revengefulness, and national selfishness. They reply by declaring that it may be easier for those who have not suffered the same losses and whose position on the map is not so dangerous to display more generosity towards Germany and confidence in her future intentions, and it becomes more and more difficult to obtain any distinct view of the future, while the past is lost in the mist like a mirage.

It is nevertheless towards the past that we ought

to turn if we believe that the new world is the continuation, not the destruction, of the old—if we believe, as we did in 1914, that there is no more contradiction between a wise internationalism and true patriotism than between nationalism and the love of the clock-tower, or between the attachment to one's native city or village and the attachment to one's home. The crisis through which we are passing is not new, and we may find a parallel situation in the struggle of Western European towns and communes against the increasing power of their princes during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Excesses were committed on both sides. At one time the town ignored the general interest of the country and clung blindly to its privileges. At another the princes indulged in brutal repression when they might have satisfied the claims of their subjects without any detriment to general interests. Finally the national principle conquered, but it was only when it had been made clear to the towns that they gained more than they lost from the establishment of the new regime.

Is it too much to hope that an effective international law will be agreed upon without so many difficulties, and that we may be spared some of the errors and excesses of fanaticism? It may be premature to find in the League of Nations the prompt solution of all our problems, but the League at least gives us two things which we vainly seek elsewhere—a means of conciliating a deep attachment to one's country with the development of an international conscience, and a constructive ideal which, without shutting the door on the past, gives us some hope for the future. For it is faith that we lack to-day more

than anything else, the same strong stubborn faith which uplifted us in 1914. If we were only able, in the hour of our triumph, to pick up some of the threads which filled our hands during our worst reverses, it would still be possible for us to be optimistic without fearing to be taxed by Dean Inge with "expecting to make a profit in buying from a Jew and selling to a Scot."

"A MONEY-POISONED CREED"

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Your initiative in endeavouring to interest the public in this very grave question is certainly timely. To those who during recent years have anxiously questioned the future it is simply astounding how few of those most interested in the discovery of a new social formula seem to have given a thought to the problem. If with its strong strain of French my English were acceptable, I should like to sketch out some of the main thoughts to which the present situation has given birth in a mind saturated with Balzac, Dickens, H. G. Wells, Ruskin, and, when not extreme, Tolstoy's and Kropotkin's literature. To the above I would like to add Sir Anthony Hope Hawkins, since his article contains the seeds from which a good crop could be harvested.

One of your readers advocates the choice of a leader? As one detached from any Church, with a mind free from all kinds of religious prejudices, I should like to suggest to him, as a light to clear all his indecisions, and a leader to follow, Christ, be he God or philosopher.

He will find in His doctrine all that which is required to remodel the world in accordance with the general desire for a social organisation better than the existing arrangement. Where, precisely, the Churches have failed is in not dissociating themselves from those who were interested in imposing values which Christ condemned. In fact, Churches are as much followers of the money creed as any member of the Stock Exchange, forgetting that Christ, the leader in whose name they claim Divine authority, expelled the merchants from the Temple.

I have no quarrel with money or capital, provided they are kept in the background of values, instead of being, as they are, made the all in all. A civilisation which rests on money is bound to come to the end which threatens ours. Plutocracy, by drawing its right to lead and to command from its possession of money, leads to anarchy. A lot of nonsense has been written about the Jews, and those who wrote it seem to have entirely forgotten that all that which can be truly said of the Jews is that, a mere handful, they have, however, imposed their conception of civilisation on a world only too willing to accept it. Ostracised, persecuted, reduced to only one activity, that of producing money, they could only dominate, or at least compete equally, in a civilisation in which money-making would seem to be the main object. To blame the Jews is blackmailing the masters from whom we have, willingly, learnt our trade. But now the time has come when the people question our right to more money than they have themselves, and our only answer is that, having it, we shall keep it.

Are we able to prove that our services to the community are, or have been, such that a greater reward is due to us than the average man is entitled to receive? If it is so, riches or capital—by which I mean the power over less fortunate men—is not the reward for which such men as we say we are work or lay down their lives, and we shall not fear to have less. If we deceive ourselves, or try to deceive others, in pressing our claim to a preferential treatment, should we be surprised when we discover that those whose share would be reduced to increase ours refuse to submit, and, being the greater number, threaten to take our share in their turn. It is between these two classes only that any quarrel exists. Higher wages will not bring peace. They simply increase the desire for more in those who have less, and exasperate their resentment against an unjustifiable power to grant more of what both parties contend is their own. The evil is at the root of the system. Deprive money of its power to dominate; give it its proper place in the estimation of values, and you will then reconstruct on solid ground.

My brain, my will, my sense of honour, my kindness, my generosity, my power to create, to work, and to produce, are truly mine; no one in his senses would claim them against me as his own. If these place me higher than my neighbour less gifted, if less manual labour is asked of me than he must do; if somewhat greater luxuries are permitted to me fully to develop my gifts, my preferential treatment is accepted in good spirit, because my superiority in will justifies itself, and its acceptance results in the improvement of our lives. The money-poisoned

creed has given a full crop during the war, and it is because so many have tasted of its fruits that one may despair of the possibility of ever curing the "sick man of Europe."

The Bolshevik cure and its *modus operandi* are Asiatic—Chinese, I should say. They may prove acceptable to the nerves and the minds of those who have invented the public gardens of tortures (Jardin de Supplices. Octave Mirbeau). To the European mind and soul, its creed and leaders can only be repulsive; but it would be a mistake to endeavour to make of the disapprobation of Bolshevism an argument against those who urge the need of a cure for our dying civilisation.

INVENTOR.

THE ABNEGATION OF SELF

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The letters appearing in your columns on the question of the "New World" should do much good by stirring up the minds of the thinking public. To this section of the community must we look for ideas as to the means of working out our salvation. Nothing could be more to the point than Miss Hobbs's contribution: indeed, one may safely say that therein lies the solution. Reiterating and amplifying some of her statements, the remedy is "knowledge of God." This, I hold, is conscience. It is clearly the duty of those possessing this knowledge to produce in others by influence, by speech, by written articles, a similar conscience, *i. e.* a knowledge of God's will, or, again,

a discernment of good and evil, to show the multitude what to seek; then, seeking, they will find.

The up-hill task is for this minority possessing the knowledge to impart it to the majority, to cultivate in the public mind a conscience. Christ's work was to give the world a conscience; that work has been progressing for nearly two thousand years. It must be accelerated by a new effort: it is a huge home missionary work without sect, without creed, save that of putting right first and self somewhere afterwards. Selfishness is the root of all the wrong, past and present. Neither this nor that section of the people is to be blamed, but man. God has always desired and always will desire good to triumph; it remains for man to see that it does in the future by letting goodness underlie all his actions. It will be a slow business, but the longer it is deferred the greater the task. "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor" may sound a difficult teaching, but the first step towards it is, "Do your best; work and earn your wages." If every one would do his best—well, we should have the new world.

R. M. POULTER.

36, Courthope Road, N.W. 3.

LIFE'S GREATEST LESSON

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—I have read with great interest the articles and the consequent correspondence appearing in your columns under the heading, "Is it a New World?" and in my opinion the thanks of the country are once more due to your paper for having initiated

a discussion, which must be helpful, and should be profitable. Particularly am I interested in the letter signed by "Working Man." Surely in that letter lies the crux of the question. Passing Tower-hill daily during the luncheon hours I hear "Down with the Capitalist," only to be told at other hours that the "British working man is a person not to be trusted." Such phrases are common to the ears of every one. How then can it be a new world? As I write I have the famous poem "Abou Ben Adhem" before me, and I suggest that when the great majority of the people of the nations of the world can truthfully and "cheerily" say, "Write me as one that loves his fellow-men," then only will it be a new world, because the "love of God" will have blessed us all, and we shall have learned the greatest lesson life can teach.—Yours, etc.,

EX-SERVICE MAN.

IDEALS AND REALITIES

BY SIR SIDNEY LOW

THE world-war, which ended formally with the Treaty of Versailles, was the greatest political and economic upheaval in recorded history. None of the convulsions and revolutions of the past, not the break-up of the Roman Empire, the Crusades, the Turkish and Mongol irruptions, the Saracen conquests, the discovery of America, the Napoleonic wars, nor even the Black Death, touched so many peoples and so large a portion (indeed, it was practically the whole) of the habitable globe. In the ebb of this cosmic wave it is natural to ask ourselves whether finer structures will not be builded upon the wind-swept and water-worn wreckage. Humanity, we feel, should emerge from an ordeal so terrific nobler, purer, wiser, better. The Old World having broken down rather badly, it seems that there ought to be a New World, with all the latest modern improvements. Let the dead past bury its dead. It is for us, purged by sacrifice and suffering, to set our faces to the future, and to turn from the hatreds and prejudices, the obsolete barbarisms, the clumsy expedients, the spiritual dullness, which led us to calamity. It is natural; and in this, at any rate, there is nothing new. Men and nations, escaping with their lives from a dangerous malady, are usually in the repenting,

reformatory, and on the whole, cheerfully expectant, mood. This is the common sequel to a great war. It is felt that the dreadful experience must not be repeated. The "war to end war" has been fought; never again shall civilisation be guilty of a sin so stupid and so savage. Pacifism grows popular, and the soldier is pushed into the background as an unseemly anachronism.

After the long period of exhausting conflict which closed with the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, the Abbé de St. Pierre gratified all the intellectuals of Europe with his massive work in three volumes, which he called the *Projet de Paix Perpetuelle*. The "Project" was much applauded, but it did nothing to prevent the intermittent warfare which filled up the next hundred years. There was the same optimistic tendency after the close of the Napoleonic era, somewhat retarded in its manifestation by years of international hostility and general unsettlement. By the 'thirties and 'forties of the last century Britain, in the full flood of the swelling industrial tide, was dreaming ardently of the New World, which was understood to be rapidly and successfully shaking loose from the bad old past, with its wicked jealousies, its mediæval survivals, its greedy materialism. We get it all in those famous stanzas of *In Memoriam* :

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Thus was Tennyson writing in 1841. In 1920 we look back on the long catalogue of intervening wars among nearly all the nations of the globe, and tell

ourselves how sadly vain was the message the poet heard the wild bells ring out to the wild sky eighty years ago.

For us the bells are pealing again. Can we truthfully draw from them the inspiration which comforted, and misled, the good Victorian singer? Are we ringing out the thousand wars of old and ringing in a thousand years of peace? It scarcely looks like it. Several wars are still raging, and the sky is dark with the clouds that herald wars to come. We have smashed the military monarchies, broken up the great armed empires. This was held to be essential to the new world-order with peace and international amity for its basis. But the republics which fill the checker-board of Central and Eastern Europe are just as pugnacious, aggressive, and mutually distrustful as the larger aggregates out of which they have been sliced. Perhaps they are even a more constant danger to peace. A war between the Great Powers is so tremendous and appalling that it cannot happen very often. After all, France and Germany kept the peace for half a century of jealousy and passionate resentment. Will it be so with these smaller States? Serbs and Bulgars and Greeks, Czechs, Poles, Lithuanians, and Ruthenians are torn by rivalry and deep-seated animosities. They are still too near the Middle Ages to have acquired the modern distaste for fighting; and with their peasant populations, and more primitive social organisation, they can fight with less risk than the highly industrialised communities. Will the League of Nations, armed with nothing more lethal than protocols and resolutions, keep order among them? Will it prevent

the greater nations from seeking a violent solution for quarrels already working up to danger-point? So far as one can see, the New World is not going to be a world of international concord.

DAINGEROUS NEW FAITH

It may be a world of civil war and desperate class struggles. More serious than the international confusion is the social chaos. Labour, which had already gained political power in the democratic countries, acquired economic mastery through the war. It could sell its toil at its own price, and speedily took advantage of the situation to place itself in such comfort as it had never enjoyed before. Wages were raised in some industries to an entirely uneconomic level that bore no relation to output. The credit of the community was pledged, and its savings and invested capital realised, in order that the members of the powerful trade unions should be paid at constantly rising rates. On the top of this comes the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, which is in reality the preaching of a new religion, that of the divine right of the proletariat. It is the most formidable movement which has shaken Europe and Asia since Mohammed. Like the early Caliphs, Lenin and his associates spread their gospel with fire and sword. And Bolshevism, like Mohammedanism, makes a definite appeal to the emotions of vast multitudes, for it brings a fierce dogmatic creed into an atmosphere long clouded by uncertainties and outworn beliefs. It proclaims that all wealth, all power, all privilege, all opportunity should be made over to

the obscure mass of manual workers, and held in trust for them by uncontrolled communist executives.

From Russia this doctrine is surging outward, reaching home to the proletariat everywhere, in Turkey and India and China, in France, Germany, Italy, Great Britain, Ireland. Ruinous in its results as it may be, steeped in blood and crime as in Russia we know it is, it gains ground, it makes converts, it fascinates myriads of labourers, who are tired of monotonous toil and hope to live in ease and leisure, as they suppose the bourgeoisie and capitalists have done. Many in all classes who are not revolutionists regard the movement with indulgence, since it chimes in with the vague humanitarian socialism which has superseded the older individualism. There is a bitter and terrible conflict, a "heavy civil war," as Lenin cheerfully suggests, to be fought out before communism is either victorious or vanquished. That is one of the phases through which our new world may have to pass. It will not be a quiet or easy one.

No doubt in time the new order will "beat its music out." We can hope that when the transition period is over a finer civilisation will be evolved. Scientific invention and discovery will be employed to make life worthier and more humane for all, instead of rendering it, as at present, for the most part noisier, less fruitful, more uncomfortable. The machinery of production and exchange, and the political system, will be brought into closer relation with our wider knowledge of physics, biology, and mechanics. The great army of mankind will move onward and forward, with banners torn but flying, as

it has done after other convulsions and cataclysms. We need not despair of our New World.

LIFE NOT A SUMMER CAMP

Only let us remember that we are all anchored in the past, and we cannot take in our moorings with one bold swing, and sail away to fresh uncharted seas. There are idealists who imagine that but for the foolishness and depravity of men—usually of other men—life might be a pleasant holiday for everybody. They dream of a Utopia, which is rather like those charming summer camps in America where a number of cultivated persons meet together for genial intercourse and innocent recreation. But Life is not a summer camp. It is more like a besieged city, assailed by foes without, menaced by disaffection within, strictly ruled and severely rationed. On this planet, which is a speck of dust among the stellar spaces, in this existence, which is a moment between two eternities, we maintain ourselves only by unceasing travail and stern inhibitions. There has seldom been quite enough of anything to go round among all the inhabitants of this planet: not quite enough food, not quite enough rest, not quite enough love.

Men and nations are often hungry, not always because of their own misdeeds or the misdeeds of others. Virtue and reason will not make everybody happy, or give to all individuals or all societies the fulfilment of their desires. Two reasonable and virtuous young men aspire to wed the same young woman. She bestows her hand on one of them, with

the result that the other is disappointed, perhaps heart-broken. His virtue and his reasonableness have not saved him from sorrow and failure; which yet has not been caused by any lack of reasonableness and virtue in others.

Even so is it with communities. The restricted island-group of, let us call it, Gombroon, is inhabited by over seventy millions of people, energetic, ambitious, progressive, exceedingly prolific. If they continue to increase and multiply their country will presently be too small for them. It will not supply them with food, nor with the other things they need to sustain a rising standard of comfort. Lying over against them is the mighty continent of Tigrosylvania, with illimitable resources, an immense territory, and an insignificant population sparsely strewn along its seaward rims. The Gombroonites propose to discharge a few of their superfluous millions upon this half-empty delectable land. The Tigrosylvanians will not permit the immigration, being resolved to hold the country for their own racial stock and racial culture. You cannot say that either party is actuated by unreasonable or unvirtuous motives. Gombroon is entitled to release herself from the peril of starvation, Tigrosylvania has the right to keep her breed pure. But here we have two aims, two aspirations, both intelligible and legitimate, which yet cannot both be fulfilled. How decide which shall prevail, which shall be relinquished? Will the New World be able to find some solution less violent than the methods whereby the Old World commonly dealt with such contradictions?

We all hope it may. But we must recognise that

it has still to count with those elements in nature and in human nature, those inexorable laws and uncomfortable forces, which caused most of the troubles in the past. It cannot prescribe that a door shall be open and shut at the same time; that one body shall fill the portion of space occupied by another; that the increase of food shall always keep pace with the increase of population; that the price of commodities shall bear no relation to the cost of the labour engaged in their production; that conflict, competition, the play of opposing energies, shall be eliminated from life. All living is struggle, movement, defence, attack. Those who seek a static Utopia of contentment and repose must provide not only for a new world but for a new universe. Are not the stars held in their courses by the unending urge and resistance of warring impulses? Could you stand upright on your feet if there were not a power within battling against that other power which is pulling you to the ground?

HUMANITY'S STRONG SERVANT

So let our vision of the New World be chastened. We have not made a sudden break with the past, and its inheritance is with us, whether we choose to disclaim the legacy or not. Our international perplexities, and our social disorders, have geographical, economic, ethnological, and historic origins, from which we cannot cut ourselves loose at a stroke. Every age has its own burdens; and when we get rid of some that have long weighed upon the shoulders of humanity we find them bowed under a new load.

But also each has its own special agencies and instruments; and in this of ours we have one, beyond the reach or imagination of our predecessors, in the modern development of applied science. Machinery has multiplied the efficacy of human labour, and mechanical locomotion, transport, and communication have brought to the whole earth a kind of unity which it never knew before. Dimly we begin to see what these things may mean if rightly used. Nations can never live in isolation again, when the very thoughts that move one can thrill through others, not in years or months, but in days or minutes. The machine may go far to do for all men in the modern world what slavery did for the fortunate minority in the ancient societies. It will not abolish the curse, or the solace, of labour; but it may alleviate the drudging, monotonous, soul-destroying manual toil, which kept the majority of the human race, in most countries, brutish and depressed.

The New World will have its own problems to face, and gradually, and in one fashion or another, it will resolve some of them. But do not let us imagine that it can create an earthly paradise, wherein we shall fleet the time pleasantly, without effort and without strife. It is, I am sure, the sub-conscious thought in many minds just now that if the world is not built on that model it ought to be; and that self-denial, industry, devotion to duty, courage, patriotism, are qualities which there is no great need to cherish since they will presently be useless. In the sunshine and peace of the Garden of Eden we can shed our protective armour of uncomfortable restraints and painful obligations. Labour will soon

be unnecessary; so let us regard it as a passing infliction, and do as little of it as we can. The old morality will fade out with the old order which it fortified; so we need not allow this troublesome survival to deaden our zest for indulgence and enjoyment. I think this kind of sentiment, vague and unformulated though it may be, accounts for much of the social disquiet and emotional restlessness of these times. Unhappily, there is no earthly paradise awaiting us; the Angel with the Flaming Sword stands at the gate of the Garden of Eden. The New World will only be the Old World, modified, matured, and, we hope, amended; but still a world of conflict, of strenuous effort, of duties often irksome, of constant struggle against evil and dangerous forces, against materialism, selfishness, and greed. Before men and nations there will still lie obstacles and impediments that cannot be overcome without fortitude, endurance, self-sacrifice, and vigilant discipline. All that is worth saving in the Old World came that way. For the New World also is there any other?

PRECEPT AND EXAMPLE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Dean Inge writes: "I fear that an ecclesiastic will not allay the irritation by insisting that the cause of the evil predicament is moral, and that if the world would give the Gospel of Christ a fair trial all would yet be well." Before an ecclesiastic invites "the world" to give the Gospel of Christ a fair trial, would it not be advisable for him to invite the Church to give it a fair trial? "The world," at least that

part of it that is nearest to us, has read the Gospel of Christ; and it has sufficient intelligence to enable it to compare that Gospel with the practices of those who claim to be its chief exponents. It sees functionaries of the Church adorned with copes and robes of gorgeous colour, and texture of highest value, posing and strutting, encompassed by attendant satellites; and side by side with this it calls to mind a picture of the Son of Man walking by the Lake of Galilee among His humble disciples. "The world" sees ecclesiastics intriguing and scheming for place and power, elbowing each other in their eager pursuit of preferment; and it remembers an apostle who taught, and exemplified his teaching, "Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbour's good." "The world" has read the Sermon on the Mount; but it looks in vain to the Church as an institution that has adopted for practical purposes the principles therein enunciated. The defence may be that those principles are impracticable. Even so, and there are many who, having realised this, refuse to assume the name of Christian, feeling that it would be hypocritical to adopt that designation without submitting themselves to the full discipline of Christ; albeit that, judged by the common standard, they are more worthy of the title than many of those who attach it to themselves complacently. Christianity has been obscured by the Church, which should have illumed it, or, at least, have permitted its light to shine.

It may be said that, apart from the Church of England, there is a sufficient variety of religious communities to suit every shade of Christian thought;

but this does not dispose of the great outstanding example, known and read of all men. Nor are the less pretentious bodies free from inconsistencies. Even in the Salvation Army the texture of the uniform increases in fineness with advancement in rank. In the Church of England there are many ministers who are doing noble work, sacrificing themselves in the service of humanity; but their influence is largely stultified by those too-priestly priests who, by their circus-like trappings and their ludicrous posturings and antics, attract silly women and repel sane men. But I would not finish on a caustic note. Rather would I appeal to the ecclesiastics to consider whether they cannot adapt themselves to modern requirements. That the majority of them are on the spiritual and moral side, no reasonable person doubts; and that side needs all the help that they can give. But if they fail they will be left more and more in the rear of the advancing army, which, with or without their aid, is sternly bent on giving the basic principles of Christianity a fair trial.—Yours faithfully,

ARTISAN.

THE GOSPEL OF WORK

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The persuasive lucidity and warm energy of M. René Doumic's article has glanced home to my spirit with even keener incision than any previous answer to your question, Is it a New World? Does not his plea for the gospel of work touch the spot? It exposes, I reflect with shame, England's most

irritating trouble—irritating because remediable at will. Who of us is proud of—or is, indeed, desirous of defending—the habit too many of us have fallen into of contriving how little hard labour we need attack? That deplorable demeanour—a temporary aberration, we may hope—lies at the root of our restlessness. Meanwhile, as Charles Kingsley would say, I think, if he were with us now, the women of England must work as well as weep. “In the new society,” says your brilliant contributor from across the Channel, “there will be a redoubling of activity, of initiative, and of work, which are the best guarantees of moral probity and integrity.

M. René Doumic’s brief paragraph on the new religious situation in France will be invaluable here also if it serves to check the uninformed criticism of the Churches which is so frequent. A correspondent in to-day’s *Daily Telegraph* declares it as a fact that the most vigorous spiritual forces of to-day lie outside the Church. It may be so. As one who is pretty familiar with the spiritual forces at work within the Church, I should be interested to know, what perhaps cannot be shown any more than the assertion in question can be tested, how much these outside forces, these flowers outside the gates of the Church, owe to the garden. Meantime, I observe in a recent document recording statistics of unpaid spiritual forces that there are in these islands 50,967 lay preachers and 404,980 Sunday-school teachers. After all, a few folk at least believe in the gospel of work.—Faithfully yours,

J. EDWARD HARLOW.

Wesley Manse, Canterbury, Aug. 27.

THE DOGMA OF THE CHURCH

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—May I be allowed to say a word about the letters in your issue of Aug. 27 signed “S. Q.” and “Mark Martin”? First, as to justice. “S. Q.” writes: “Two ways would be open to us—(1) to attack bad conditions by an appeal to morality; (2) to try to raise morality by improving conditions.” The Founder of the Church Himself lays down the one basis of justice, of right, of morality, namely, “Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.” This fulfils both the above methods, and on this basis alone, it may be said, can the world go on satisfactorily and peaceably. Mr. Martin complains: “It is the dogma of the Church, and not the Gospel, which she is professing to teach, which is depriving men of her leadership in the fight against materialism.” The above-mentioned basis of duty to our neighbour, coupled with the other, the first great commandment as given by the Founder of the Gospel, may help him in his estimate of what the Church is doing.

But what is “dogma”? For a long time this cry against the Church’s teaching has been raised. May I remind your correspondent that the word is Greek in English letters, and means what the mind accepts as truth, but which cannot be demonstrated; it thus differs from a mathematical problem. Now the very foundation of the Gospel message is dogma, viz. “God so loved the world that He sent His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” The

first words of the Bible are : " In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Both these passages, forming as they do the expression of belief in a Divine Creator and His love to mankind, are incapable of proof; they are dogmas.

But what is the cause of the injustice now prevailing in the world, and of the tendency towards materialism? Selfishness. Man's self-will, self-intèrest, self-pleasing, self-gratification; all these underlie all injustice, yes, and all rejection of the Gospel of Christ. Man's will is the root of the evil of the world, and has been so ever since man's beginning. It is sometimes asked, Why does not the Ruler of the world put a stop to its evils? The answer is, That He uses no compulsion. Man is a responsible being, not a machine to be driven; and man must therefore take all the consequences of the exercise of the freedom of his will, and for his actions arising therefrom.

JAMES MORGAN, M.A. Cantab.

Hampton-on-Thames.

FORCE IN ITSELF NOT WRONG

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—In the interesting articles you are publishing, and also letters, regarding "The New World," one point, I believe, strikes some thoughtful women. It is that those who prophesy the coming of a new world pre-suppose that what they call militarism and poverty are the great obstacles to the progress of the world. A member of the American Senate pointed

out that there is nothing wrong in force itself; it is the purpose for which force is used which makes force right or wrong. We find to-day in Great Britain and Ireland that organised force is permitted for selfish ends, resulting in murder, brutality, crime, and a propaganda of falsehoods, and when force is used to protect the innocent against these methods it is called militarism, and deprecated by many who uphold the League of Nations, a large portion of the Labour party, and the trade unions. These latter ordered the Government not to support the Poles against the Bolsheviks, as they would have no more war. They also refused to carry soldiers and ammunitions in Ireland to protect the police and civilians from the murderous attacks of Sinn Feiners. Great Britain does not suffer from militarism. What it does suffer from is the methods of its civil Government. That Government and the whole nation in turn suffers from the methods of the Labour party. The country did not return a Labour Government at the last election—it returned Mr. Lloyd George. Immediately strikes were organised. The power of the Labour party lies in strikes, and the utility of strikes lies in mis-called peaceful picketing. Peaceful picketing consists in interfering by violence with the liberty of men who are willing to work and have the interests of the nation at heart. When General Dyer used legitimate force to put down a rebellion he was turned out of the Army by a civil Government. An archbishop voted for his condemnation. No Middle-Class Union can save the country, as long as a minority is allowed to attack the public by violence and to destroy the liberty of others. No

Government is doing justice to a nation while it refuses to support law and order against organised violence and brutality. No Church is carrying out its marching orders "to protect the fatherless and widow, and to keep themselves unspotted from the world," when it misrepresents the truth and, throwing itself on the side of a strong organised body of men, ignores the crime, violence, and vice from which the fatherless and the widow suffer.—Yours, etc.,

C. WOODHEAD.

Brighton, Aug. 28.

BETTER RELATIONS

BY THE REV. R. F. HORTON, D.D.

“HUMANITY has struck its tents, and is once more on the march.” But a sickening doubt creeps over men as the old encampment is left, and they see the disorder and the débris on the ground where the tents were pitched; is it a progress, a march forward, or merely the unsettlement of the great war, to be followed by a return to the old spot, and a repitching of the tents in the unwholesome ruins of the past?

Certainly it is to be a new world; and our wisdom is to understand, and to throw our whole strength into, the new creation. That demur and hesitation would be our ruin. To drift back would undo us. With a strong faith, and as clear a vision as we can obtain, we must march forward. It already is a new world, in which the League of Nations is definitively accepted as the regulative idea of international relations. Though it cannot come into being at a stroke, and the birth pangs are prolonged; though France in her natural anxiety is too fearful as yet to embrace the remedy, and America in her splendid isolation hesitates to embark on the troubled waters of European politics, the word has gone forth, it is penetrating all lands and all classes. The differences of nations are in the future to be settled by law, not

by force; the armed forces of the world are to be employed to police the world, not for mutual aggression and national ambition. It is a new world struggling to be born.

In the Church, again, there is the surprising promise of a new order. The message of the Bishops in conference at Lambeth opens a great possibility. That message was determined no doubt by the war, and the discovery of the paralysis produced by "our unhappy divisions"; but it was shaped by the fact that the bishops from overseas brought to the Anglican bishops a larger outlook, and encouraged them to surrender the old exclusiveness for a new inclusiveness. Directly the bishops recognised that a large part of the true Church was without bishops, and had flourished without bishops, and had been used by the Head of the Church to carry on His work without bishops, the way was thrown open for a *rapprochement*, and it became quite possible for the non-episcopal churches to recognise bishops as the link of the divided bodies, and the security for future unity. It is a revolution of thought which will speedily lead to a new Church order, a unity in diversity, perhaps, but a unity so effective that the diversity will be a strength instead of a weakness.

UNORGANISED INTERNATIONAL

But the new world which is labouring to be born is resulting from a fact which is too tumultuous and disturbing to be easily grasped or appreciated, viz. the uplift of the workers. When the slaves were liberated by the exertions of Wilberforce, when

America emancipated her negroes through the genius of Lincoln, when the Tsar Alexander freed the serfs, there was a partial upheaval which shook the world. But what was coming to the birth before the war, though the war has hastened the process in an unexpected way, was the liberation of the workers throughout the world, not from slavery, but from an economic dependence, and a social depression which had come to seem to freemen hardly better than the old slavery or serfdom. Ebenezer Elliott, in the days of the corn laws, saw the workers passing like weeds away, "Their heritage a sunless day." And the time had come even before the war when the "People," the vast mass of the workers, were resolved to secure for themselves a share in the world's well-being, sufficient wages, leisure, and opportunities of culture, and a guarantee against the haunting spectre of unemployment. The war has made the opportunity. The workers were swept into the armies to fight, and were assured that they would come back to a land fit for heroes to live in. They demand the fulfilment of the promise; they are taking all the steps in their power to effect the enormous change that was necessary.

The movement is in all countries. There is a real if unorganised International. The new world which is coming may not be to our taste. It is very difficult for the privileged to accept the logic of democracy; it is an agony for the wealthy to contemplate a more equal distribution of wealth. And the lamentations and despondency and doubt come from the privileged, the rich, the intellectuals, who dread the plunge of democracy, cannot imagine a world in which

the leisured and cultivated classes do not predominate, a condition of things in which all would have enough, but few, if any, would have any superfluity. But that is the new world which is rising on the horizon; that is the new order which is bound to be. And if we are willing to recognise it and to co-operate in its realisation, we may find hope and satisfaction in the change which is taking place. Bolshevism is unnecessary, the morbid result of an obscurantist despotism. But what Bolshevism blindly aims at, what Marx in his cold-blooded, Godless way thought out and prophesied, is the new order in which, as the workers come to their own, all will wish to be workers; in which the accumulation and possession of large personal wealth will no longer be desirable, because a social conscience will make all find their personal good in the common good and make them wish to share what they possess.

BIRTH-PANGS OF A NEW AGE

The bloodthirsty orgies in Russia, and the violent language used even in England, stain and disfigure a movement which is dumbly making for world betterment. Revolution is unnecessary and futile. Revolutionaries are the worst foes of progress. But the change, accelerated by the war, which is passing over human life, is one which we might all hail with delight. It is what the prophets of Israel foretold; what dreamers like Morris and Bellamy foresaw. If we have courage to face it, and ability to facilitate it, we may see a new order emerge which will justify the agonies through which it has been achieved. At

a first glance the situation of the world to-day is disturbing and distressing. It seems as if the workers are driven by a demon of greed, determined to get as much, and to do as little for it, as possible, ready to plunge their own country into troubles as bad as war, in order to secure their own interests. The first glance is delusive; strive but for clearer view, and you discern a great and ubiquitous movement, the birth-pangs of a new age; it is the age of the emancipation of the workers. A new status is sought; during the war it had temporarily been reached; but it is to be maintained in peace. It is clear that by science and machinery production can be so increased that, without the overwork of any, all may have, not only the necessaries, but the spiritual opportunities of life. The great upheaval results from the dumb determination to give to the workers the fruits of their industry and to prevent the great accumulations of wealth in private hands.

Can we accustom ourselves to the idea that such a social evolution will mean increased happiness for all? Can we recognise in this change the next step in human progress? Is it a new world? Certainly. It is the reply to the Corn Law rhymers' passionate cry:

When wilt Thou save the people?
O God of mercy, when?
Not kings alone, but nations,
Not thrones and crowns, but men!
Flowers of Thy heart, O God, are they;
Let them not pass, like weeds, away—
Their heritage a sunless day:
God save the people!

And to that cry, When? The answer is: If we have faith to receive it, Now.

A MORE UNSETTLED WORLD

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Dean Inge's letter which opened this discussion is as interesting—and as inconclusive—as Tennyson's "In Memoriam." When he states in his first paragraph that "not until human nature, or inhuman nature, is altered shall we get the new world about which we prate," he seems to settle the matter and to make discussion impossible. Such alteration will never happen. And yet his letter has started a controversy which is well worth threshing out on the chance that some remedy or palliative for mankind's social evils may incidentally be discovered. In the overturn of many of our accustomed habits, in the destruction of the old order generally, in the loss of respect for human life resulting from familiarity with wholesale war-murders, in the trebled increase in the cost of living, in the revolt against steady humdrum labour aroused by the reckless, irresponsible, and open-air life of soldiering, in the revelation of the economic values of various countries, and in other changes too numerous to particularise, we are undeniably living in a "new" world.

Is the inquiry meant to suggest that it is a moot point whether it is already a better or a happier world? That could not sanely be answered in the affirmative. It is assuredly a more unsettled world. The flood has come, but the waters have not yet sufficiently subsided to afford a resting-place for an exploring dove, and the ark from which it would take flight is doubtfully safe and seaworthy. Are we likely to be able to construct a better system for

the security and welfare of the human inhabitants of this planet than anything previously devised? We talk of a new world in the sense that we desire one. But why? We are all "up against," and for ever must be, those "laws of the world we live in." We cannot oppose them successfully. The best we can hope to do is understand them, utilise them, and keep clear of the machinery (the "mills of God" ?), which would crush us if we were caught up and entangled in it.

Dean Inge's own article and all the letters which have followed it indicate no other remedy for human social ills than the universal adoption of unselfishness. The "Gospel of Christ" is the sublimation of unselfishness. To say that if men universally acted in accordance with its spirit wars would cease, jealousies, ambitions, and greed would be eradicated, and we should attain perfect social and political harmony, is very like arguing in a circle. The whole world could only be converted to this condition by the attraction of the material benefit and prosperity which would be expected to result. There will always be great sections of men who are by temperament altruistic and sentimental, and a not inconsiderable proportion would willingly suffer and make unlimited sacrifices for the good of others. But to bring about the conversion of the vast majority of mankind it would be necessary to convince them that obedience to moral law would be the best means by which they could acquire material well-being.

Is it rational to expect to be able to realise an ideal which is at variance with the whole visible facts of Nature? Is it not a "good" thing that

underlying all the fluctuations of the world waves there is a solid bedrock which never changes? Do we want moral earthquakes? Should we be happier living in a realm of miracle instead of that of inseparable cause and effect? The common and practically universal aim and desire is for material comfort. Is the solution of economic problems the be-all and end-all of human satisfaction?

It is impossible to study the conditions of human life adequately without taking into account the wonder which every individual feels more or less regarding its origin, and whether that origin is due to the creative act of an Almighty Being. In reality everything turns upon the existence of a Personal Power above Nature—a power which created Nature and presumably continues to direct it. The power which could endow self-conscious creatures with the quality of “free” will must be eternally responsible for the consequences of that act of creation. The world was new when such a power created it. It will only be new when such a power might choose to recreate it. Meantime men can only do the best they can as “seeing through a glass darkly,” and thus, by another route, one arrives at the conclusion that we are not living in a new world, and that it is not within the capacity of men to make it. Objectively we can accomplish little, but subjectively we may be so influenced that we may seem to ourselves to be deliberately making the existing world a pleasanter place to live in.—I am, etc.,

H. CROUCH BATCHELOR.

10, *Wetherby Terrace, S.W., Aug. 30.*

THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Your correspondents all seem to agree that the answer to this question is in the negative, but many of them think that a new world may be made if only a particular course which commends itself to their individual judgment is followed. We have the man of science looking “to the silent operations of science,” while another writer is satisfied that by putting down militarism and abolishing war and pauperism a new world is to be obtained. Some put their trust in the League of Nations, while another would resort to reason and goodwill. All of these may be perfectly good objects to pursue, but they are quite powerless to bring us a new world, and which of the numerous remedies for the ills of the old world is suffering from is to be tried first, and when is it expected that the cure will be effected?

During the war we were told that if only we would win the war the new world would dawn, but the general opinion is that it has not dawned yet, and I have as little faith in the remedies suggested as in the promise given to us if we won the war. I should have thought that before propounding a method for creating a new world it would have been necessary to have studied how this world was created and why it was created, for it seems essential before discussing the question of a new world we should make up our minds upon the origin and purpose of the old. The usual answer to the sceptic to the proposition that there is a God is to ask who made God? but that does not prove that there is no God, and to my mind

at least the marvels of the heavens and earth, the regularity of night and day and of the seasons, convince me of the existence of an Almighty Power, while the fact that truth and goodness guide the best of mankind convince me that these are dominated by that Power. Surely the Power that gave man life, reason, and a conscience must be greater than the created being, and the Power that can give successive life continuously could doubtless give the future life.

Believing this, then, with an earnest conviction, the next question is, Why was the earth and man made? If, of course, it is assumed that death is the end of all things, there is much reason for selfishness and crime. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," would be the natural course for a man expecting annihilation at the end of life. But what would be the object of God to place humanity in the world to die in this manner? Unless there be a life after death I can see no reason for life at all, but if there be a life after death the object of the creation of the world and the life of man is clear. Evil wickedness and crime are in the world not by accident but by design. Man is in the world to fight his way through evil, error, and crime to a higher and a nobler plane. Without these obstacles there would be nothing for him except stagnation, but with them there is a glorious opportunity to acquit himself as a man, to exercise his free will and strengthen his soul by constant conflict, so that when the days of his trial end he may be better fitted for the new life in the new world.

If we can adopt this view all the difficulties of

inequalities, injustices, pain, and suffering which some bear, and some do not bear, are explained. It is necessary for the discipline of some souls to have more trials and some less; there may be a series of lives to live before the soul of man becomes perfected, and it may be that some have passed through more trials than others in a previous life. How small the ills of life if this be true, and does it matter what happens to the body if the soul survives? If these convictions are right, though it would be quite right to propound remedies to subdue every evil, one will not look for the creation of a new world in the present life. Would it not be better to teach the principle embodied in those beautiful lines of Christina Rossetti:

“‘Does the road wind uphill all the way?’

‘Yea, to the very end.’

‘Will the day’s journey last the whole long day?’

‘From dawn to night, my friend.’”

Let man understand that his duty in this life is perpetual labour and perpetual conflict, and bid him take up the challenge which his duty casts upon him, but do not lead him by false hopes to expect the new world before its time.—Yours faithfully,

ARTHUR N. LANGHAM.

The Chumlette, Egmont Road, Sutton, Surrey.

A WORLD ADRIFT

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—I am convinced that if the public Press of Great Britain could be induced to concentrate its energies on a public campaign to educate its vast

circle of readers on the principles of education and enlightenment on such questions as economics, moral and social progress, enormous benefit would accrue. As the result of the disintegrating forces arising out of the war, European civilisation has drifted from its moorings, the old order has changed, and the new has not become fixed. Men are bewildered by the sudden and complete change. The teachings of science and philosophy have not been absorbed and digested by the great mass of people. The teachings of the Church, with its clinging to old traditions and beliefs, are found wanting, and inadequate to the needs of the day. People are turning away from the Church and seeking relief and solace in other directions—in humanitarian-social directions.

Christ's teaching, as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount, was a very simple formula, and one that might have sufficed right up through all the ages faithfully to guide mankind, but, alas! the Church has superimposed on the simple teaching a whole mass of superstition and dogma that is simply impossible in these enlightened days. The war has shown that the sterling qualities of courage, truth, and goodness are still a strong driving force in humanity. In all this welter of bitter hatreds, class warfare, and commercial greed there is a great danger of all the splendid achievements of the past being submerged and lost. Man has struggled and fought his way upwards along a difficult and tortuous road, and is capable, under wise and beneficent guidance, to attaining to still greater things; but the spirit of brotherhood, of justice and liberty, must be kept steadily in view. There was never a time in the

history of this England of ours when men of ability and public spirit were more sorely needed to come forward and assist the nation. The eyes of Europe—and, indeed, of the whole world—are upon England, and it is for her to give leadership and courage in dealing with these great problems.

W. H. NEEDHAM.

Melbourne Place, Strand, W.C., Aug. 30.

BROTHERHOOD OF SACRIFICE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—There is much evidence that we have entered a world of ideas which, disclosing and insisting upon new relationships, may make a new world. One of the deeper lessons of the war is the brotherhood of sacrifice as expressed in the Military Service Acts, which to Britishers was the simple principle that the community claimed the individual life as held forfeit for the protection of the community. The individual now asks the community, As you held my life forfeit for your service, what is the measure of your obligation to me? Some ask it in terms of economics, some in terms of leisure, some in terms of sharing control, some in terms of worship. The ferment of the idea of brotherhood leavens the whole lump of society.

We are in a new world, painfully striving to read its laws, know its conditions, and to adjust ourselves to the new life. The working classes, through their trade unions, are not the only folk who are conscious of this urge of association. Citizens of all classes feel

the impulse and hear the call. Neither is the economic bond of association the most powerful, although bulking largest in the public mind at the moment.

The principle of association of brotherhood is permanent, but its expression is ever varying in complex forms. It is re-born and cradled in every family, and perpetuated by intelligent appreciation in every organisation or stifled by rigid formalism. Groups of theorists, making appeals on lines which are popular and obtain a quick response, draw false conclusions from their success, reproducing in an organisation the faults of individualism, whereupon the scornful and cynics exclaim, This is no new world; it is the old one getting worse! It may be that the tangible proof that we are in a new world will be the functions entrusted to the State, which in Great Britain is the truest expression of the largest measure of the public will. By the manner in which we mould our State and the powers given to it will be known whether Britain was awake when the new world of ideas came into being.—Yours, etc.,

J. A. SKEET.

4, *Lebanon Road, Croydon, Aug. 30.*

CLASS CO-OPERATION

BY THE RIGHT HON. J. R. CLYNES, M.P.

WE measure the world by our own position in it, but in relation to the world problems the right measure must be a new measure. The new measure must take account not merely of events in our own kingdom, and the tendencies which are fast becoming a formidable part of the factors which make for great change. Immense communities lie outside this part of Europe. Many of them have experienced little of the effects of the Great War in the sense of knowing much of the appalling physical and material losses which the war involved. Indeed there are peoples in these communities who may not know that there has been a war at all. In India, Africa, Japan, China, and other parts of the world the people are not asking themselves the same question in relation to the war which we are asking. This is true of Turkey, Arabia, and some parts of Europe which lie far out of Russian territory. In Russia itself the idea of a new world presents itself to many of us in an aspect so revolting that people dread an attempt to establish a similar world here by similar crazy and criminal means.

Now what we in Britain can do in relation to all these things matters much. Indeed, the influence of our conduct upon events in remote parts of the world has long been a potent influence, and can still be

exerted for the real benefit of mankind. To this end many things must be done, but two things are pressing and essential. I am not thinking of these two things in the terms of political action or party controversy. I submit them because no internal harmony can be established unless the outstanding parts of our labour questions are satisfactorily settled, and unless we handle with greater success the problem which Ireland presents to us. To continue as now in Ireland for, say, another two years would do damage to our reputation for government which in fifty years we could not repair. To continue as now with our labour difficulties is to inflict upon ourselves material losses and limitations almost as severe as, say, Germany must suffer in her efforts to pay the penalties imposed upon her for her crimes in relation to the war. No new world, in relation to the life conditions which man can determine, will emerge until new leadership is given and new light is thrown upon the bigotries and class interests which distract great masses of our people to-day.

PHASES OF IGNORANCE

The greatest difficulties are rarely due to designed mischief or deliberate intent to do harm. They are due to ignorance expressed in two very different forms. Workmen, for instance, and many of their leaders, are ignorant of the severe losses which they suffer because of the work of production being suspended either through avoidable or unnecessary stoppages, or through substantial limitation of output resulting from the fear which workmen have that if they produce more than a fixed quantity they will

be threatened with two dangers. One is the danger of unemployment, and the other is the danger of wage reductions. Both are dangers which the organised strength of workmen can destroy. They present themselves to the working-class mind as real risks, because in former years they were real experiences. In these days it would be an easy matter to make such terms as workmen are entitled to exact the subject of definite bargains which both employers and the State should loyally keep. Meantime, workmen are unaware that dearness is in large part due to scarcity; that lack of houses and commodities of all kinds has very severely reduced the purchasing power of the workmen's wage, and whilst giving him a high rate of pay has imposed upon many a standard of subsistence scarcely any better than in pre-war days. The most pitiful aspect of this ignorance is that which has caused workmen to believe that the more they produce the more the employer stands to benefit. The reverse is the case. Restricted output or a state of scarcity due to whatever cause, has not reduced employers' profits. When quantities have gone down prices have gone up, and profits have been maintained at a level which often has given employers even a bigger yield of gain for reduced quantities of products. When workmen have said that greater output would only fill the warehouses of the capitalist class, they have deceived themselves by a phrase. The warehouses are anyhow the channels through which goods for the public must pass, and to the extent that these warehouses are depleted public inconvenience and working-class privation may be the result.

The other phase of ignorance is less excusable. It is the ignorance of those who have every cause to know better. There is a class, if not very large, still too numerous, who deserve the abusive title of the "idle rich." Their obtrusive and gaudy displays of money power, and the unashamed exhibitions of personal luxury or extravagance, are a far greater provocation to unrest in the world and to a disturbance of moral standards than all the efforts of agitators whose efforts are limited to the party platforms.

ADVANTAGES OF AGREEMENT

Now both these classes have everything to lose by continued divisions, and everything to gain by mending their ways. The appeals made in high quarters for a greater degree of world peace and world co-operation will fail unless within our own kingdom there is a greater degree of class co-operation. The class struggle can be continued, and all classes who are parties to the struggle can continue to lose all that is involved in fighting each other, and may contrast that loss with the gain which co-operation surely would give. Each class may carry on the struggle with the idea of some ultimate success. Each may be capable indeed of achieving a temporary triumph, but no one class can carry, or ought to carry, its victory to the line of permanent dominion over the other. It would be better now for the contending factions in the State to recognise that in respect to the material needs of life an understanding and agreement would become these factions better than the

continuance of the struggle. A new world in the peace period would begin if for (say) five years the nation worked for it as it fought for victory in the five years of war. Until the material sides of our quarrel are adjusted our spiritual and moral sides will be under heavy restraint.

In only one respect has our part of the world been changed by the greatest event which the world has known in modern times—the war. It has changed in its detestation of war. Millions of people now accept the view that to have peace we must prepare for peace; that peace is better than war; that we cannot have peace by preparing for war, and that all the devices and all the skilful and cunning preparations for settling differences by sheer weight of force is a horrible mistake. The League of Nations is not yet a guiding star, either with politicians or peoples. But the principle of the League has got to the length of convincing people that if in the near future countries like Russia and Germany could be brought within it, and America could take within the League the place which she prepared for herself but is still vacant, this great world organisation would create within peoples and Parliaments the same idea which most individuals now have in relation to doing wrong. That is, the idea that they must not do wrong, because it is wrong, and because if they did not do right they will have to answer for it to a court which they have established and sanctioned. In practice such a League would not only go far to rid us of the crushing burdens of military conscription and armaments, but would more than anything else help to exalt political activities and redeem Parliaments, which in

the estimation of many persons of influence in the country have fallen from the place which they should have in the esteem of the people.

EDUCATION AND UNREST

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—To my mind, the change and unrest brought about are due, not so much to the Great War, but to modern education and over-education. As a professing Christian nation, we should feel ashamed that modern education neglects to instruct the youth of the country in the fundamental and immortal doctrines of the Christian faith, by which alone we can have “peace on earth.” In place of this we have greed and grasp amongst all classes, and little or no respect shown for any one, not even the Almighty. The Education Act of 1918 will cause many a child who would become a useful miner or carpenter or other manual worker to join the overcrowded “respectable” brain-workers. Why should manual work be so despised? Could one imagine a university student becoming a miner? Is it not a fact that many university men are a failure through being spoilt by the lavishness of their education? Is it not also a fact that the over-development of the brain causes physical weakness: that the strongest (physically) men and women are not gifted in other ways; that mental strength is frequently accompanied by bodily weakness? Plain facts and common sense are too often overlooked in these days through educational ornament or camouflage. In ornamental detail the

main structure is overlooked. We must not use our common sense (or natural gift of education), but work according to a profound theory or formula.

A learned lady amongst learned professors at the British Association at Cardiff spoke of the unearned income of the working classes being the amount they received above their value in work actually done; but she (as an educationalist) forgot to refer to the unearned incomes of other classes comprising the amount they received above their value for work done, or who share with labour the plunder of more than fair profits for their work. It is education which is teaching the masses to play with words instead of working; to study the problems of the day instead of doing their little bit; and we as tax-payers are educating them, and yet still treating them as children without responsibility. We are shortly spending £150,000,000 on education to unfit Labour for labour by forcing an elaborate system of education on many unwilling youths. Personally, I learnt little until after I left school, and life is one long term of education.—Yours, etc.,

THOMAS S. COPP.

Putney, Aug. 29.

THE WORKER WINS

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—If it be a new world upon which the nation is entering, it certainly cannot be a better world, for better worlds cannot be built upon false hypotheses, nor erected upon very faulty foundations. There

can be no improvement for a nation in which the majority thinks that the losses of a long and terrible war can be regained by a greatly diminished output of labour, and that we can make up for lost time, more than four years, by taking life far more leisurely and easily. There can be no lasting improvement for a nation which plans to build a happier, more prosperous state in defiance of the fundamental principles of the Great Architect of the Universe. One of the most evident laws of the world, holding throughout the whole realm of animate nature, is this—the worker wins.

In the race and battle of life the race goes to the swift and the battle to the strong. It is nonsense to think that the race will go to the slow or the battle to the weak. Say not that this is the German doctrine that might—physical might—is right. The nation which is mightiest in soul as well as in body will go forth conquering and to conquer. Nothing can stop it. It will win life's race and gain life's battle. The worker wins. We are entering upon no new better world if the motto and policy of a great part of the nation is "Don't do your best!" The soul is diseased to heed such advice, and with idle or unwilling hands there is neither chance nor hope whatever for real and lasting improvement.

It cannot be a better world on which we are entering, for a better world would be a wiser world, and there is no sign of increased wisdom when the majority thinks that the net final economic and financial result of the most devastating war in human history is for nearly all people easier times, shorter hours of labour, higher wages, less production in the labour

world, less restraint, and no financial strain. They act as if war were an economic blessing. They have yet to learn completely that such a war is a most disastrous economic curse. In the soul of man, from primeval times, there has been an ineradicable disease, an evil spirit. It has lain almost latent at times, but when restraining influences have been withdrawn there has been development of the spiritual disease, and the events of recent times are symptoms of a severe recrudescence—the means to do ill-deeds make ill-deeds done. It is the same old world in which we live. The soul of improvement is improvement of the soul, and there is no sign of such improvement when we learn that the ravages of vice and the results of impurity are working such havoc in the nations as was never known before.

It is universally admitted that our nation cannot survive without foreign trade and markets. Can any one really think that the dawn of the Millennium is visible on the horizon when the people are planning, by increased prices, to be able to offer poorer value in the foreign market than any other nation will offer?

Six years ago Labour leaders told us most confidently that there would be no more war. The workman at home would say to the workman on the Continent, "Comrade," who in turn would say, "Kamerad," and all would be amicably settled. That was proved to be a most disastrous delusion; it ended in more slaughter in the last five years than in the preceding 500 years. Surely no new sign there of a new and better world.

Again, the Government has shown how £66,000,000

per annum might be paid by foreigners towards reducing our debt, but miners' leaders say, "No, we must have for our own union and selves the larger part of that." See how it works out. Whoever likes may pay the debt; the miner won't. He must have 2s. per shift increase of pay. There is nothing new, only things are done on a larger scale than formerly. In olden times Dick Turpin held up individuals, demanding their property, but now great combines and unions, instead of holding up one or two people, hold up the nation, saying, "Your money, or I starve you." Nineteen centuries ago He who was despised and rejected then said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." The decay of public worship, the decided secularisation of Sunday, the decrease in the religious teaching in elementary and secondary schools, the increase in the ravages of vice, all clearly point to the fact that He is still rejected and His advice unheeded; but of this we may well be sure, that there will be no new, brighter, better world until the nation yearns more zealously for a more godly soul. When the nation as a whole is prepared to follow faithfully the advice, "Whatsoever thy hand and whatsoever thy soul findeth to do, do it with all thy might," and when the nation as a whole can see that His advice to seek first the kingdom of God must be followed, then we shall be entering a new, happier, better world as surely as there is a wise God above us.

F. S. THETFORD.

Macclesfield.

THE SCRIPTURAL PROMISE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Mr. W. L. Courtney in his able article writes to the effect that it is not possible for the world as a whole or for men individually to make a clear break with the past, thus inferring that a new world or a new man is not to be looked for. This is probably true from a philosopher's point of view, but the words of the greatest of teachers, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," seem to imply something different at least as far as the case of the individual is concerned. New birth decidedly suggests a break with the past, a commencing life over again. True, the old man is not entirely destroyed, but when Christ comes into a man's life the new life overwhelms the old, many of the old propensities are killed, others are subdued; in the individual's case to a large extent "old things have passed away, all have become new." Something very analogous to this is to be looked for in regard to the world itself; on the authority of revealed truth we may anticipate a regenerated earth. This will not be brought about by any process of moral evolution, for notwithstanding the immense advance that the human race has made in material betterment, mankind is apparently no better morally and spiritually than he was a thousand years ago; the late war has demonstrated this fact beyond all possible dispute.

Neither will the new world be brought about, as Dean Inge suggests, by the mere preaching of the

Gospel, for after nearly 2000 years of preaching the impression it has made is but comparatively small. The words are still true, "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life; a few there be that find it."

How, then, will this great reformation be brought about? "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done as in heaven so on earth." Christ has not taught His followers to pray this prayer in vain or to no purpose, but the petition will be fulfilled to the very letter. Our Lord compares Himself to a "certain nobleman who has gone into a far country to receive a kingdom and to return," and notwithstanding the fact that his citizens have in effect sent a message after him, saying, "We will not have this man reign over us," He will most certainly come back. Some of your readers will think me a visionary, but be that as it may, on the authority of the inspired Scripture we are assured that Christ will as certainly come again as it is a fact that He came before, not indeed, as at the first, to humiliation, but in power and glory; and in some definite way (exactly how I am not prepared to say) He will assume the government of the world. Then there will be such a revolution in comparison with which all the political upheavals of history will be as nothing. He will begin by suppressing all injustice and evil. "He shall rule the nations with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Having done this, He will inaugurate that blessed time of peace when, as Scripture states, "Men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks,

and the nations shall learn war no more." Then, and not till then, shall we be able to answer in the affirmative the inquiry, "Is it a new world?"—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

R. ASHFORD.

26, *Anson Road*, N. 7.

STRENGTH OF IDEALISM

BY W. L. GEORGE

IT seems unwise to answer by a simple "yes" or "no" a question such as this. Indeed, it may be that no question does any direct answer satisfy, that all human certainties are tainted with doubt. Certainly, when one is asked whether a new world has arisen from the war, one is equally tempted to say "yes," and that a radiant Venus has emerged from blood-red waves, or "no," and that the bird born of the ashes of Europe is the phœnix of old, as foolish and bloodthirsty as in the past. The circumstances of our period lead us to these absolute attitudes. Having conceived the easy illusion that the war would remould the world and revive creation, the optimist despairs as he beholds the conflict in Europe, the frivolity and extravagance in his own country; likewise, the pessimist takes for justification of his fears trifles that amount only to appearances. Both grow excessive in their view, because neither has ever admitted what is probably the truth: that war modifies neither men nor manners; it merely stimulates or retards change.

Yet it is important that all thoughtful persons should attempt to see the situation sanely, because it has seldom been so grave. It seems that the war has brought Europe into a blind alley, that it has

pulled down Powers to set up others, that it has broken Peter to armour Paul, that it has left standing covetousness, injustice, and ferocity, standing only in different shoes. Those who do not accept this diagnosis will say that a strong reaction is manifesting itself against the vices that made the war, and set up their faith in the "march" of the human spirit towards better things. They may be right, but they will find it difficult to prove that a united will, whether in Great Britain or in any other part of the world, is able or willing to promote peace or reform. No "march" is perceptible; all we can see is ebullition.

It is saner to recognise that severe national rivalries have been created, and that they can lead to wars. There are for this a number of causes. The first is the formation of new Powers, which tend to intoxication, to desire growth because they have secured existence. The creation of Bohemia, Poland, and Greater Roumania may mean Pan-Czechism, Pan-Polish, Pan-Rumenism, and the wars their ambitions entail. The second is the establishment of "unredeemed" populations: to-day we find millions of Germans under Czechs, Poles, Frenchmen; of Hungarians under Rumanians; of Poles under Russians. This has led to war before this, and may do so again. The third is the land-locking of Austria and Hungary. Serbia fought six years for a harbour; our ex-enemies may do likewise. The fourth is the internal weakness of the beaten Powers, which offer a chance to Kemal Pasha in Anatolia, to the Junkers in Germany, to Jafer Tayar in Thrace . . . and therefore to foreign intervention. Lastly, there is

Bolshevik Russia made into an enemy of the West by accidents and errors. Russia will become the natural leader of all the malcontents.

FAITH AND THE LEAGUE

That is not a new world. It is the old world—more so. It is a new world only in the sense that it is a more inflamed world, where injustice remains, but from which the resigned spirit that made possible the tolerance of injustice has disappeared. True, there is a new fact, the League of Nations, to which we gave our faith two years ago, the League which many of us wish to sue for breach of promise. Indeed, the League is a pop-gun to slay a dragon. Made up of official representatives of the secret diplomacy school, not of members of Parliament; comprising only the Allies and a few neutrals, excluding our ex-enemies; deprived of the support of Russia, the largest nation in the world; rejected by the second largest nation, the United States; compelled to achieve impossible unanimity in decisions, it is indeed a poor thing. Indeed, the League may be worse than a poor thing. Described by Mr. Balfour as being merely the Supreme Council of the Allies, it may be that the League perpetuates under the olive branch the secret understandings, the greedy compacts, the ambition and the hate that have for thirty centuries filled Europe with war.

Already the League of Nations has taken on the uncertain contours of a dream. Born in lip-service, it may die in conversation. Already it is ignored. It has had no share in ordering the affairs of Poland;

it has not intervened to settle Anatolia and Thrace. Instead, it has allowed single Powers to cope with the disturbances, and therefore single Powers to claim their reward. Its one success, the sharing of Teschen between Poles and Czechs, is typical. Unable to decide the justice of the claim, it has divided the land in dispute between the claimants.

Yet do not let us make the mistake of abandoning faith, for faith can move battalions. As Mr. Chesterton once said, there is no courage but that of the forlorn hope, and it seems sane and safe to compare the League of Nations with our Parliament in the days of George IV., when it was an assembly of landlords' nominees and of bold buyers of votes. The Reform Act, followed by the bracing influences of Disraeli and Gladstone, substituted our great Parliamentary institution for corruption and folly. Thus, it may be our privilege to make a true ruler of peace out of the toy we to-day call a League. This evolution, of course, assumes a certain honesty in internal politics, and it cannot be denied that the signs are at present rather unfavourable. As there can be no decency in foreign affairs unless there is decency in home affairs, we cannot avoid concern with our own politics.

There is no doubt that we are severely suffering from the disappearance of parties. Coalitions are effective in war, when the object is single, viz. the winning of the war; in peace, coalitions suffer from an incurable disease called internal compromise. Compelled to satisfy two sides, they please neither, and live in fear. Until we recover the party system (whatever the parties may be) there will be no true

leadership in this country, for leadership, in such a welter, must go to the most commercial minds. None but the middle and labouring classes can arrest the control of "big business." From the gentlemen of England there is nothing to hope. In Lord North's Cabinet of twenty-one, formed under George III., we found two Dukes, one Marquis, six Earls, and only one commoner; in Mr. Lloyd George's Cabinet of twenty-four only five belong to the gentry, and all but one are commoners. The gentlemen of England have played their part in history; history is not likely to cast them again.

A WORLD OF WASTE

In that sense we are living in a new world. The invasion of pure politics (by which is meant administrative questions, such as Home Rule, the poor law, divorce) began roughly with Chamberlain; to-day it may be said that economic questions dominate affairs. If there were no unrest in Ireland, the House would concern itself solely with trade, land, housing, etc. Indeed, the British Parliament is converting itself into a British Chamber of Commerce, where big business is, directly or indirectly, filling the majority of the seats. This does not seem altogether a bad thing, for the politics of the 'forties were often unreal, but the dominance of trade does lead to a material conception of the universe. It does foster greed and ambition. Thus it conduces to the development of harshness in the human mind, while it must tend to kill the generosity of social service, and the romantic strife towards ideal brotherhood.

Reflections of this more or less modified state of mind are found in our manners, which are rather more ferocious than they were in 1914. Here, again, there is no new world, for men, needing bread, women, needing bread and freedom, were always combative; but one cannot deny that the struggle is fiercer than before. The tendency of the world is towards excess. It is said that at the Bar it is common to earn £200 a year, fairly frequent to earn £10,000 a year, but almost impossible to earn £700; likewise it seems that the world will give us only everything or nothing. If it gives us everything, it allows us to waste it. In that sense there is a new world. The shift of money into hands that had never enjoyed it, the mushroom birth of vast fortunes, have promoted an extravagance more than Byzantine. The new world is a wasteful world, and nothing but force will mend its orbit.

That is to say, the world can be sobered only by higher taxation; higher taxation is necessary, not only for the redemption of the debt, but for the reduction of our pleasures, the cooling of our heads. This need not lead to official waste. Economy can go with high revenue, though it seldom does. Indeed, there is here room for a bargain. The State could be allowed to impose new taxes equal in amount to its annual economies. "£1 tax for £1 saved" is a motto, which, if applied, can restore our financial equilibrium, and the mental balance of the over-amused.

There appears to be no other remedy, because we all clamour for economy and do not ourselves give the example. The call of duty pipes too low, or

maybe there is no one to utter it. It cannot come from an educated sense of duty, for education has yet to plough a furrow that is generations long; it cannot come from the Churches, who are accentuating their pre-war drift away from spiritual guidance and towards merely ethical rules; the remedy for mental disorder can be administered only by the tax collector, who harbours neither pity nor illusion. About that rough discipline idealism can entwine itself; idealism has not been created by the new world. Idealism was present already when savage tribes exacted blood-money to compensate the family of a murdered man. Idealism is eternal, and never has it been so strong as it is to-day, never so determined that war shall be banished from the earth, never so ready to labour and to suffer. Its enemies are ready, and idealism will know many defeats. Neither cruelty nor idealism is new to a world riven by the struggle between the gods and the titans; yet it seems that idealism cannot die, for it contains the obscure essence of life, and so the dim moment may come when hands gentle and intelligent shall have grafted with the principle of rich fruits the crab-apple tree of a bitter world.

“ARTISAN” AND THE CHURCH

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

Sir,—On one page of your issue of Sept. 1 are quoted the words of an outspoken vicar, whose parish is “in the centre of an artisan district.” On the next, by a strange coincidence, you print the letter of “Artisan,” which is especially significant in the

light of the vicar's condemnation. Little imagination is required to connect "Artisan's" conventional diatribe with the words, "he has neither wit, education, culture, etc.," in which the vicar of St. Matthew's, Southsea, gives expression to his opinion. At the time of the Reformation "Artisan's" ideas of "ecclesiastics elbowing each other in their eager pursuit of preferment," "adorned with . . . robes of gorgeous colour . . . posing and strutting," etc., would doubtless have appealed to the reforming minority, while the element of truth in them might have rankled in the hearts of the Catholic majority, but that any sane man of the twentieth century should seriously so picture the Church of to-day seems hardly credible.

Does "Artisan" realise that nearly all curates and many beneficed priests, possessing the "wit, education, culture," which his own class lacks, are paid much less than most artisans, that the ecclesiastics, whose gorgeous robes he condemns, frequently have difficulty in finding the wherewithal even to clothe themselves properly, that the rich vestments of which he complains are worn in comparatively few churches, and then not for the adornment of the wearers, but because of their devotion to the Blessed Sacrament?

"Artisan" goes on to accuse the Church of obscuring the truths of Christianity. A very slender knowledge of ecclesiastical history would have saved him from this strange error. He concludes by exhorting ecclesiastics to adapt themselves to modern requirements. Christian truth, he must know, is unchanging, and cannot therefore be "adapted" or diminished

at will. If he thinks that the Established Church is not alive to the many problems with which Christians are now confronted, let him read the encyclical letter recently issued by the bishops of the Anglican Communion, assembled at Lambeth.

There is nothing new in his letter. He simply brings forward the old outworn complaints against the Church, which have now been current for many centuries, while he utterly ignores the vast amount of good that she is daily doing. "Artisan," in venturing calmly to dispose of a vast problem, shows how dangerous a little knowledge may be to its possessor—especially that little knowledge which is harder to combat than ignorance even. His letter is of some use, however, simply because it shows how weak is the position of those who consider the Church to have failed. If they are unable to produce a better champion than "Artisan," the sooner they disabuse their minds of the belief that the Church has failed the better for themselves. When "the Church" is spoken of, the priesthood is generally meant, not the whole body of baptised Christian people. In this limited sense the Church has never been more efficient than now. Her priests are hardworking, her churches cared for, her sacraments frequently administered, her canons and rubrics more generally obeyed than heretofore.

If there has been any "failure" the blame must ultimately rest with the laity. If they wilfully absent themselves from the Church's services, if they disregard the means of grace which she only can provide, if they fail to devote their brains and money to the advancement of Christianity, if they prefer to criticise

their priests rather than to join with them in fellowship, theirs is the loss, and on them must fall the blame. "Artisan," although he has failed to establish his contention, has opened the way for those who wish to testify to their belief that the Church has in no way "failed."—Yours faithfully,

ATHANASIVS ANGLICANUS.

CHRISTIANITY AND PROGRESS

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—It moves one to some surprise to read the frequent attacks made on the Church, as distinct from Christianity. It is the Church, they say, that has obscured the purity of the faith of Christ. At least, no one but the Church thought it worth while preserving at all. It is strangely difficult to make people realise that without the Church there would have been no Christianity to-day—no record of Christ's life, His death, or His teaching. They continually utter the reproach that the Church has "failed." How? Failed to be perfect herself, and failed to make the world perfect, certainly. But did she ever expect to do either on this side of death? I think not. On the other hand, every great advance of humanity since the first century has had its origin in the Church—hospitals, education, sociology, honour for women, the equality of all human souls before God, the sanctity of marriage, and a thousand others. It is true that she has held back in many of these matters, when once they were started—that she has been more inclined to preserve the traditions

of the past than to lead the march of the enthusiasts. The fact remains that though she did not assist women to Parliament, she yet made them the equal and the helpmate of man; though she does not push all the claims of modern Labour, yet she was the first to declare that virtue, and not rank or riches, was a man's title to honour—and to practise that theory. In the feudal ages, where alone could a peasant work up to the highest and most honoured position? In the Church—for all its much-talked-of snobbishness. And so on in instances beyond number.

The Church has faults indeed—has had, and will have always. There is no need to recount them, for they are on all lips. But it may be remarked that those most eager to reform her are themselves of her number; those outside care little whether she is reformed or not. And while a soul is conscious of its shortcomings there is hope for that soul, or for that body of souls called the Church. The critics that condemn her for mistakes of policy, for failure to attain to her ideals, or for the faults of her members, are not helping the world of humanity. They are hindering. Let them rather acknowledge their indebtedness to that without which the world to-day would be immeasurably worse than it is; let them admit that her ideals, if so far unattained, would not without her even be ideals; and let them remember that her abuses and shortcomings are not hers, but those of the world she is for ever combating, without and within.

It is easy to start mushroom growths of philosophies, morals, cults, and creeds; the hard thing is to live up to the light we have. Could we all work

together to reform and help forward the Church, we should have enough to do, remembering always that the Church is not many, but one—one union of all the faithful in Christ their Head. And this is Christianity.—Believe me, etc.,

N. W. JAYES.

*Oakdene, Kennylands, Emmer Green, Reading,
Sept. 1.*

DISILLUSIONMENT

BY SIR SIDNEY LEE

MY reply to this perplexing question is in the negative. Very specious, to my thinking, are current appearances of novelty or novel experience. Around us lies a world, well-stricken in years, which is overwrought by excessive strain. It is the old world with all its veteran passions and prejudices abnormally accentuated by a great morbid convulsion, and most of its generous instincts and exalted aspirations are either eclipsed or struggling for existence. It is the old world somewhat blindly seeking to restore its moral, spiritual, political, and economical equilibrium, which has been rudely shaken by the inevitable brutality of a long and desolating war.

The glib prophecies of 1914 which foretold at the coming of peace a final triumph of right over might, and the emergence of a new heaven and a new earth, have been proved by the event to be the merest tinkling of cymbals. The confident assertion that this war would summarily end all war is now recognised to be a hollow mockery. The ancient doctrine of cataclysmal action is obsolete, and faith in abrupt conversions of mind or matter challenges elementary laws of nature. "Humanity has struck its tents and is once more on the march" is alluring and picturesque epigram, but the figurative phrase is

capable of no very literal interpretation. There are no sudden breaches with the past in human affairs. The future stumbles on under the burden of what has gone before, and a spasmodic effort to get rid of the baggage of the past never gives a new forward movement genuine promise of security.

I liken the world at the moment to a sick man, of mature age, who has lately passed through the crisis of a dangerous illness and is now in the grip of consequent exhaustion, for which he is seeking a quick remedy with desperate eagerness. He is ready to try any nostrum, any experiment, if there be any plausibility about the prescription. Homœopathy has attractions for him. His disorder has been caused by war and bad blood. He is sorely tempted by the delusion that the renewal of bad-blooded war, albeit in some social or industrial shape, may prove a short cut to improved health. He cannot discard faith in the proverbial efficacy of "a hair of the dog that bit him." The crying need is to convince him that salvation lies anywhere save in this discredited kind of empiricism, which stump-oratory is always at hand to urge. The only hope lies in the patient and deliberate development of a conciliatory temper, in the purging of the whole system of its fatal load of bitterness, ill-will, and suspicion. The thing is easier said than done. The patient has some excuse for many of his therapeutic heresies. His experiences up to date of allopathic treatment are disappointing. The League of Nations, which was confidently credited by his physicians with the certain qualities of a panacea, has failed to operate. The so-called elixir of "self-determination" has rapidly evaporated.

Such signal disillusionment retard the patient's recovery and foster restlessness and recklessness.

HISTORIC PARALLELS

Appeal is rather fitfully made to history by commentators on current affairs; yet a comparison of the present with the past is a corrective of "grim and comfortless despair," for the old world has already pulled through many tragic and desperate crises, and the broad perspective of centuries shows the dissipation of disasters and difficulties as portentous as those that confront us to-day. Human nature has experienced little or no fundamental change in the course of the ages of which authentic records survive. The unchanging conditions of human nature prescribe the lines which events follow. History repeats itself in essentials, despite endless modifications of circumstance which forbid positive identity of experience. The very word Revolution, which now commonly implies the overthrow of established institutions, literally means the act of revolving or rotating. The expression is still so used by astronomers. There is philological ground for expecting in military, political, or social upheavals which are labelled revolutions something of the rotatory tendency which belongs to the motion of the heavenly bodies and brings them back in due time to their point of departure. At any rate the oracles of history are never dumb, and it is always politic to consult them.

As in the recent war, so during the Napoleonic wars, patriotic fervour and the sense of a common danger for the most part checked in England domestic

agitation, whether in political, social, industrial, or economic spheres. But no sooner had the Battle of Waterloo brought the prolonged military conflict to a glorious conclusion than political, social, industrial, and economic discontent, which had been temporarily stifled, found trumpet-tongued expression. Pride in the military prowess of the nation was quickly exchanged among the people at large for rather short-sighted and misconceived maledictions on the policy which had involved the country in war at all. High prices, heavy taxes, decreasing employment, were plausibly declared by the popular leaders to be the only tangible results of the strenuous military effort, and drastic political, social, and economic change became the universal cry of stump-oratory. Social order was menaced. Disturbances drove the Government into the ill-starred haven of penal repression. All classes, save perhaps hereditary landowners, shared in the unrest and disaffection. The temper of the middle class, within eighteen months of the stirring victory of Waterloo, may be gauged by the action of the Common Council of the City of London, which in December, 1816, addressed the Prince Regent in terms like these :

“ Distress and misery are no longer limited to one portion of the Empire, and under their irresistible pressure the commercial, agricultural, and manufacturing interests are equally sinking. We can, sir, no longer support out of our dilapidated resources the overwhelming load of taxation. Our grievances are the natural effect of rash and ruinous wars, unjustly commenced and pertinaciously persisted in, where no rational object was to be attained; of immense

subsidies to foreign Powers to defend their own territories or to commit aggressions on those of our neighbours; of a delusive paper currency; of an unconstitutional and unprecedented military force in time of peace; of the unexampled and increasing magnitude of the Civil List; of the enormous sums paid for unmerited pensions and sinecures; and of a long course of the most lavish and improvident expenditure of the public money throughout every branch of the Government, all arising from the corrupt and inadequate state of the representation of the people in Parliament, whereby all constitutional control over the servants of the Crown has been lost, and Parliaments have become subservient to the will of Ministers."

Such was the language of responsible citizens. Incendiary agitators improved on its resolute tones. Prophets foretold a social upheaval in England corresponding with the French Revolution of 1789. Yet the storm was in due time weathered. A peaceful settlement was gradually reached by the conflicting interests. The ingrained respect of the English people for law and order finally rejected extreme counsels, while conservative suspicion of all innovation was overruled. Concessions removed the most urgent and genuine of the popular grievances, and although only a part of the popular claims were met at once, many of those which were for the time passed over were pressed forward with success at later dates, when fresh circumstances deprived them of revolutionary menace. Recent English history teaches that the dominant public opinion of this country is prone to seek pacific solution of political, social, and economic

problems, however acute. There is an abiding faith in the virtue of the *via media*.

In like manner quarrels and misunderstandings threatened the good relations of England with her Allies of the great Napoleonic wars almost as soon as their common purpose—the ruin of their arch-foe Napoleon—had been accomplished. Within little more than a year of the victory of Waterloo the Allied rulers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia formed apart from England the Holy Alliance. Thereby they gravely challenged those principles of popular liberty and “self-determination” by which England professed to stand throughout the long conflict. But the diplomatic tension was ultimately relaxed without a breach of the peace, and this country’s prestige and influence gained rather than lost.

BOLSHEVIKS AND JACOBINS

The most arresting feature of the world’s present condition is the revolution in Russia, which is spreading death and disaster within and without the borders of that vast Empire. The revolution in Russia closely follows the course taken by the French Revolution of 1789, and the years that follow. As in France, so now in Russia, moderate reformers, who for a short time guided the helm of the revolutionary State, were violently displaced by a small band of Jacobin extremists, some of whom crudely assimilated the anarchic creeds of revolutionary doctrinaires, while others of the gang were moral degenerates, who were attracted by the opportunity of indulging a lust for blood and other satanic passions. The

relations of our own Government at the moment with the oligarchy of extremists in power at Moscow are barely distinguishable from those subsisting in 1792 between Mr. Pitt's Government and the Jacobin rulers of the National Convention of Paris, who were challenging the populaces of all Europe, in open defiance of their Governments, to adopt their subversive doctrines. In spite of the terrorist policy of massacre and pillage with which the National Convention relentlessly pursued all so-called "counter-revolutionaries," the English Ministry declared against any interference "in the internal affairs of France or in the settlement of the Government there." No word of protest was suffered to escape the lips of any British Minister when the dethroned King of France was, with many of his attendants, openly subjected to prolonged torture and then guillotined.

Chauvelin, the unrecognised representative in England of the new French Republic, with numerous French Republican agents, anticipated practically all the current activities of MM. Krassin and Kameneff, while the Foreign Secretary of the French Communist Government, M. Le Brun, filled the exact rôle of M. Chicherin. Immense importance was attached by the Jacobin leaders to propaganda in England. They eagerly played with the fancy that England was ripe for revolution on French lines, in spite of aristocratic and middle-class hostility. "No one in England," writes Chauvelin early in 1792, "now doubts the success of the French Revolution. The people of Great Britain are tending to our principles, but those principles are combated by the enormous influence of the Ministry and more dreaded by the rich merchants

than even by the Peers. The patriotic societies, however, throughout England are daily increasing in numbers, are voting addresses to the Convention, and are preparing a festival in honour of our triumphs. Grave troubles are gathering in Ireland. The Catholics are very discontented, and three regiments have been already sent over. In Scotland also there is much discontent. . . . The god Republic has opened the eyes of the people of Great Britain. They are now ripe for all truths."

The French Republican agents were instructed by M. Le Brun to give in England every support in their power to the current agitation for Parliamentary reform, and to distribute everywhere French revolutionary literature in English versions. Especially were the French Republican agents ordered to foment in all ways rebellion in Ireland and to keep in close touch with the United Irishmen (the Sinn Feiners of their day), who were preparing an insurrection. English and Irish agitators who satisfied the agents of the sufficiency of their Revolutionary ardour were invited to Paris, where they were fêted and were admitted with ostentatious ceremonial to the honour of French Republican citizenship. On Nov. 19, 1792, the French Convention promulgated a decree announcing that the French nation would grant fraternity and assistance to all nations that sought to regain their liberty. The decree was widely circulated by Chauvelin and his colleagues in English, and to the protest of the English Government against this persistent intermeddling in domestic affairs the retort of the French Republican Foreign Office was as insolent and as arrogant as any current Bolshevik

dispatch to Lord Curzon or Mr. Balfour. The Jacobin Government anticipated that new code of diplomacy which authorises every species of breach of confidence in negotiation with a foreign Power. Any expression of courtesy in English intercourse with the French agents was advertised in France as a sign of Ministerial fear of the English people's growing revolutionary sympathies. Even the English Opposition leaders, who found much to approve in French Republican principles, came to express resentment at the impudent claim of the French Government to teach, through their agents, the arts of rebellion to the people of England and Ireland.

Meanwhile the French Republic, threatened by Continental neighbours with foreign interference, drew the sword, and the Convention's hastily levied armies met with startling success. Flushed by such victories, the Republic ultimately broke off its irregular diplomatic relations with England and declared upon us a crushing war. Doubtless the Bolshevik leaders would be nothing loth to imitate their Jacobin masters here as elsewhere. But the circumstances in a military regard are not precisely parallel. None the less, the French analogue offers present-day Russia sure comfort in its tribulations. The Bolshevik usurpers can be credited with no greater staying power than their Jacobin prototypes. Their impending fate is that of the Jacobin usurpers of 1792, who suffered meet retribution when their fury decayed after three years of wild blazing. A form of government on the sober lines of the French Directory of 1795 will before long restore to Russia a civilised polity.

“ RIGHTS ” AND “ DUTIES ”

But instructive and, on the whole, reassuring as is the pursuit of historic parallels, the counsels of history need supplementing at the present juncture. A more dynamic pilotage is required at the instant to check the disruptive tendencies which appear in recent months to have gained ground everywhere. Unless it be possible soon and effectively to quicken, in the conscience of this country and of the world, the sense of that community of interest which ultimately binds classes and peoples together, war, at any rate of one or other sectional kind, must flourish for a long time, to the general danger. It may possibly be of profit to learn how the practical point at issue has lately presented itself to the mind of a rather uncommon member of that class whose leaders here seem bent on keeping in perpetual blaze the flames of conflict in the industrial sphere.

A young North of England miner, who interests himself in poetry, has quite recently written to me of his literary aspirations. It is only incidentally that he makes reference to the spirit now moving men of his vocation, and there frames, as it seems to me, an invaluable curative formula. My correspondent cherishes a view of life which is quite alien to that of the vast majority not merely of his mining comrades, but also of his fellow-countrymen and countrywomen of all occupations. In the course of much military service he, quite contrary to ordinary experience, came to realise the saving graces of imaginative art, as more especially conserved in great literature. The same revelation was vouchsafed to a

few, albeit to a very few, others on our battle-front, but most of the soldier-idealists of the war enjoyed previous intellectual training which had not come my correspondent's way. The ideas underlying my correspondent's outlook may be expressed thus: Materialism is the normal creed of workaday humanity, which of necessity devotes its main energies to satisfying material appetites. This war, which exceeded other wars in the fury of its appeal to elemental brute forces, could not fail to intensify the normal tendencies to materialism in well-nigh all who engaged in it, directly or indirectly. The mammonism which rages to-day through all the social strata is one of the most obvious and insistent manifestations of the materialistic sentiment which the war stimulated beyond precedent. Idealism is, of course, not extinct, but it is in danger. Its articulate apostles, although some of them barely seem conscious of the unquestioned fact, lift their voices in a materialistic wilderness. By the mass of mankind the appeal of the idealist is unheard, or if heard at all, it is heard in disjointed fragments, which are ignored as unmeaning jargon. Yet the cult of idealism alone guarantees healing peace and goodwill, while materialism scatters broadcast the poison of war and ill-will.

Such is the state of affairs which my miner correspondent seeks to diagnose from his lonely watch-tower. The remedy which he propounds is no magical specific, but it is worthy of close attention, especially in view of its source. A certain Utopian savour is no disadvantage. My correspondent recommends that all classes of the nation—his own class not least of all—should be taught, in season and out of season,

a lesson which he regards as practically new. The mass of us, he argues, are morally numbed by the obsession of war-materialism. It must be brought straight home to us that we are laying a wholly undue stress on our "rights" and no stress at all on our duties. I agree with my correspondent in thinking this to be, in brief, the sum of the whole matter.

The first and last need of the moment is a well-defined and workable alliance between our conceptions of individual, class, and national rights and the performance of our duties to our neighbours, to the community, and to the civilised world. The agencies which might be expected to aid us here are, for the most part, broken reeds, otherwise the void would have long since been filled. Neither religion, as it is commonly expounded, nor education, as it commonly operates, offers the great mass of mankind, whatever may be true of select coteries, any efficacious teaching of this reconciling kind. Some new machinery of propaganda is required whereby war in all human relations—political, social, or industrial—should be tricked out in its true colours as the universal hand-maid of mercenary materialism, which exalts materialist "rights" and ignores non-materialist "duties." Wherever men and women gather together, this truth deserves proclaiming in trumpet tones.

LOST WAR IDEALS

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—For the publication of the thought-provoking series of articles appearing under the heading of "Is

it a New World?" and not less for the publication of the correspondence those articles have evoked, I am sure many of your readers would join me in thanking you.

"Is it a New World?" Somehow or another, consciously or unconsciously, "new" when used in conjunction with "world" has come to have the connotation of "better." Such connotation seems to have been tacitly accepted by all those who so far have contributed to the discussion. Is it a better world? Since *prima facie* a worse world was a world in which each man lived in his own way, regardless of his fellows—that is, lived a purely selfish life—it would not appear to be unreasonable to assume (if indeed it be not more than an assumption) that a better world is one in which a greater measure of co-operation obtains than obtained at an earlier stage. Is there a greater measure of co-operation amongst men? This question readily resolves itself into another. Is there a greater readiness to surrender the immediate claims of self to a larger unity? Such a surrender is surely the basis of co-operative effort. One recalls the great measure of co-operation attained during the grim days of war. With pride one remembers the achievements of those days:

"They brought us, for our dearth,
Holiness, lacked so long, and Love, and Pain.
Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage."

What secret was behind it all? Was it not this? The ideal unity which appealed to our loyalty was

widened, so that, going out far beyond trade, class, aye, and even national unities, it linked men of all ranks in a common cause. But Peace came, and with her coming nations, classes, men crept back into their labelled shells. The unity which now appealed to one was himself, to another his trade union, to another his class, and to another some particular phase of nationalism. So the ideal narrowed down; divisions became more marked; the better world for which men had hoped became more remote. We needs must come out of those shells, which so narrow down our ideal that our vision of a better world is one of a world better from either a trade or a class or a national point of view. Search where I will, I can find no proved way of escape from this narrowness of ideal except that made plain by one Jesus. His way widens, so as to o'erspan the narrow and immediate unities of trade, of class, and of nation, the ideal which appeals to our loyalty, and thus He unites men in a common cause against all forms of selfishness. Thus it may be a better world.—I am, yours, etc.,

WILLIAM H. KING, Captain.

7, *Victoria Street, Newark-on-Trent.*

THE CLOSING OF AN EPOCH

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph.*

SIR,—The disorder which is at present in the world, and which is of such a character as to force us to consider it—the wars, Bolshevisms, industrial difficulties, anomalies of religious expression—all this is the mark of the closing of an epoch of the race.

Three great Eras may be distinguished, the first prehistoric, the second historic, the third in the future. The first Era was prehistoric, but with continuations into history. The Book of Job, for instance, bears witness to a patriarchal system of life like the tribal system of some uncivilised races to-day. This period is the time of a Ptolemaic system of astronomy; the earth is a flat plane, the sun and moon are its lamps. God is a man who walks in the garden. The patriarch is a divine despot, the tribe are a commune under him. But with the fuller development of the intellect the Copernican system of astronomy is discovered. Man's earth appears but a speck in a vast cosmos, his own sun is only one of many. Thus man appears insignificant, crushed by his own science. God's justice also appears obscure, for with the progress from a simple tribal system the mere expansion of activity causes, or makes more visible, injustices which there is no patriarch to set right. But especially "this appearance of spheres rolling in a void," as Blake calls it, is a blow at his infantile faith. Thomas Carlyle remarked that we are in this epoch in the thick of the confusion attendant on the discovery of the Copernican system and on all the implications thereof. It is at the end of the second Era that we now are. Man's logical intellect is but a product of cosmic time; it was developed as his hand, to serve the uses of existence. It was not primarily made to solve the problem of existence. One of its uses is to destroy false theologies. But unaided it can never build a true theology. On the contrary, unaided it produces materialistic systems, "delusions of Ulro,"

as Blake named them, as if the universe were an orrery.

Let us be calm. There is that within us which may be called Mind, of which Intellect is but an offshoot, a time-experiment; and from this Divine Mind the universe also and all things were created. They are thus subject to that which is in us, if we will but turn to it. The uprising of a chastened religion which, in a few at least, shall lead the new Era yet to be born, will come in time, and is perhaps even near. Most certainly this will be a form of Christianity. From extant forms of Christianity the workman is repelled; partly that some are pompous, partly that some are pretended, partly that all are divorced from any true leadership of secular affairs, as well as that all, however vehement and serious, have accepted the first historical elements of their beliefs in a spirit of intellectual levity. The workman has therefore, on the whole, thrown away the Bible, and is being tempted to drop back into a spurious form of the first Era communism plus a despot, but without the God that walks in the garden. The restatement will come, and the reorganisation. There is a deep element of good in this our nation. But it must not be forgotten that we have many a bridge to cross yet, and many a storm to meet; and that the demeanour and effort of faith themselves solve all problems, whether we in this generation see the new Eden or no.—I am, etc.,

EDWARD WILLMORE.

2, Church Place South, Penarth.

A TEACHER'S VIEWS

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—I have read the many interesting articles and letters under the heading, “Is it a New World?” and the letter by “Spectator” is so true in all its views that it deserves to be noticed.

Many people think that the new spirit which is now prevailing is due exclusively to the Great War, but as a teacher I have seen and noticed this spirit developing itself for some years. It is not the fault of the new generations if at the cross roads they follow the wrong one; it will be the fault of those who have trained them. For some centuries the children have been trained to follow imagination. This imagination until now has given quietness, hope, and satisfaction to the majority of people; but now that majority is a minority. What young people require now is to be trained in thinking, because they no more imagine, but think.

Amongst the 8000 or 4000 of students who have been under my notice and tuition a great many have asked my opinion about their dogmatic or religious environments. I have always declined to enter into discussions or give my opinion, especially to Roman Catholics; but I have always told them to consider and ponder well on the following points of positive science: (1) That there is no limit to space or to the Universe; (2) that time is non-existent; (3) that there is no beginning nor ending to this world and Universe; (4) that at present we are matter and immaterial, next we shall be earth or powder, next gas, then again earth, then matter, and again beings;

simple transformations; (5) that they must realise that some billions of planets must be like our planet, inhabited.

When they have well considered these scientific facts, then they could see if they were in accordance with theories which had been taught and inculcated to them. This training to think will lead the new generations out of the past and present entanglements of imagination.—Yours faithfully,

A. ALTHOUSE.

12, *Upper Phillimore Place, Kensington, W. 8.*

ENGLAND AND FRANCE

BY M. RAYMOND POINCARÉ

(Ex-President of the French Republic.)

You have requested my opinion on some of the questions which, at the present moment, are pre-occupying the public mind; and you have most amiably interrogated me as to the future of the world, just as if I were in the confidence of the Almighty and one of the masters of destiny. I am no more than a simple observer of events, and can only reply by way of hypotheses which doubtless will be rather empty. Here, at any rate, are the conjectures upon which, as it seems to me, it is least daring to venture.

The idea of progress which has been expounded by eminent writers in England and France is of modern origin. It was unknown in antiquity; it had hardly made its appearance in the classical age; it was really born in the eighteenth century, and only developed step by step with the great scientific discoveries. In proportion as he penetrated the secrets and discovered the laws of Nature, man has believed that perpetual evolution of the universe was, at least on this globe, a regular march towards the best, and faith in progress assumed a sort of religious character. This postulate, to which the experience of centuries did not, perhaps, bring a

decisive justification, has had the incontestable advantage of stimulating among the peoples the spirit of invention, the demand for social improvements, and even the aspiration towards a superior morality. But perhaps it has had the inconvenience of causing humanity to lose sight of some permanent truths, and of allowing it too easily to believe that to have mastered the physical forces, such as steam and electricity, was sufficient for the transformation of its own essence and the correction of its old instincts. I am afraid that this mistake still counts for something in our present deceptions.

Certainly General Smuts is right when he tells us that this indefatigable humanity has struck its tents, and is once more on the march. An eternal wanderer, it is always on the march. But is it marching towards the reality of happiness, or towards new mirages? That is what nobody knows. Let us therefore make an attempt to perceive on the horizon a few indications of the future.

GERMANY'S STRENGTH

You ask me if I think that, in the international order, a new world is making itself manifest. Yes, and no. Yes, in the sense that, as you say, the principle of nationalities and the formation of an important number of young European peoples have profoundly disturbed the traditional relations of the Powers and brought about a formidable attack on the old doctrine of equilibrium. No, in the sense that to-morrow will, to a great extent, be made of yesterday and to-day. You speak of the temporary disappearance of Germany. Have you really, then,

the illusion that Germany has disappeared, even for a time? Perhaps she has disappeared from the sea, in the circle which is closest to British attention, but on land she remains very much alive, very active, and even, unfortunately, very threatening. As I am unable to suppose that the non-execution of the Treaty of Versailles is due to the weakness of the Allies, I am forced to admit that it is because of her own strength that Germany is not handing over her guilty officers, is not giving to France the coal promised as a compensation for the destroyed mines, and is receiving advances from the Allies before she has discharged her debts. It would, therefore, in my opinion, be very imprudent to regard her as a negligible quantity.

Nobody more than myself has desired the birth of the League of Nations. With Viscount Grey I believe that among the most frequent causes of international trouble it is necessary to include ignorance and misunderstandings. The League of Nations will accustom the peoples to know and to understand each other better; it will help to dissipate mutual suspicions, and to prevent conflicts which might be caused by a reciprocal bad interpretation of their plans. But as it has been organised by the Treaty of Versailles the League of Nations does not possess any of the means of action which France demanded on its behalf. Unfortunately, however, international dissensions do not all arise from ignorance and misunderstandings. They are very often caused by the irreconcilability of interests or by the violence of national passions. And even to-day, do we not see the League of Nations mocked by Soviet

Russia, and very much embarrassed, on the other hand, in frustrating German intrigues in the territories which it is called upon to administer, at Danzig and in the Sarre basin? Every time that humanity strikes its tents and sets forth on the march, it carries with it all the old trunks in which are contained the jumble of its vices and its virtues. A League of Nations which has neither powers of control or organs of execution has only very poor chances of succeeding for long in maintaining the peace of the world. It runs the risk of finding itself, sooner or later, powerless in the face of imperialistic ambitions, jealousies, and covetousness.

FRANCE AND ENGLAND

Let us permit the League to extract the maximum of utility from its incomplete constitution; but let us guard ourselves against believing that its uncertain operation places us henceforth beyond danger. To relax from the care of guaranteeing the intangibility of Europe, confiding entirely in the League, would mean the preparation of cruel disappointment for ourselves. It would be better to preserve, in the first place, and to strengthen our other securities. The best, the one of which we are masters, to keep intact and to render more and more efficacious, is the Franco-British alliance. Although it was not crowned, before the war, by any diplomatic agreement, it already existed implicitly between our two nations. After having shed their blood for the same cause on the same battlefields, will England and France now, in the time of peace, take separate

roads? That would mean to expose themselves to the worst misfortunes. Whether we are going to enter a new world, or simply a renewed world, or, more simply still, a new phase of the old world, two great neighbouring peoples, who have the same conception of right and of liberty, will continue to have need of mutual assistance.

I do not know if your other questions admit, on each side of the Straits, of identical replies. Are we witnessing the birth of a new world in the political or in the moral order? That is a mystery upon which it is by no means certain that we can project the same light both in London and in Paris. I venture, therefore, only to give the impressions which I receive on this side of the Channel. I like to think that if the patriotic union which was formed, in face of the enemy, in each of our two countries does not entirely survive the war, it will, nevertheless, leave behind deep traces in our minds and our hearts, and that it will lead us to subordinate secondary to general interests. A more united England will be stronger; a more united France will be stronger; and the union of these two augmented forces will be of benefit to civilisation.

Furthermore, I hope that the terrible shock from which we have not yet completely recovered, and which still brings to the surface of things much detritus and not a little scum, will eventually leave behind itself more of beauty and moral grandeur than of evil ferments. As you say very truly, no epoch has been more fertile than our own in examples of courage and abnegation. But here, again, it is not enough that humanity should have folded its

tents so that it can advance by rapid strides along the road of perfection. Political progress, like moral progress, is not automatic and spontaneous. It is, indeed, of all the forms of progress the one which is the slowest and the most recalcitrant. It depends upon all of us to set it in motion and not to allow it to stop. In this work, also, the alliance of our two countries will not be without use. May they remain hand in hand. And it is thus, in that old attitude of friendship, that it will be easiest for them to enter advantageously upon the new world.

AN INDIAN VIEW

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—If the stupendous changes that we have witnessed within these six years do not make a new world, one wonders whether there is ever anything new on the surface of the Earth. The seasons come and go, and yet it would hardly be correct to say, for instance, that it is always the same old spring repeating itself. There is invariably some growth, some change, some peculiarity that marks it out from those that preceded or followed. There have been events in the history of all countries which mark the beginning or the termination of a period and stamp it as radically different. Yet, I venture to think, few, if any, parallels could be found to the extraordinary transformation brought about since 1918. It is a wave that has engulfed not one country or people, but practically the whole world. From the highest to the lowest, each, in some form or other, is made to feel the tremendous force of that impact.

It is the fashion to say that history repeats itself. If it were so, why does not some learned historian enlighten us as to where certain events would lead, and thus save us all this groping in the dark? But the wisest and the most experienced is not able to tell us where we shall stand a year hence, any more than all the statisticians of the meteorological department are able to foretell what the weather will be like next week. We are certainly passing through no ordinary changes. The wreck, material and moral, of much that we once fondly believed to be permanent should be a sufficient indication that the old world is dead. If it is not a new world, then surely the word "new" has lost its meaning.

The very causes which extinguished the old have quickened another, and that with a fullness of life the like of which it would be hard to find. True, for the time being all looks dark chaos; and yet, perhaps, the dawn of a brighter morn is not far off. If it is asked what has been the most outstanding feature of the two years since the termination of the Great War, one would feel inclined to say unhesitatingly—loss of faith in men and principles. Generalising apart, I listened to Mr. Lloyd George, Viscount Bryce, and the distinguished American at the great meeting in the Central Hall on the occasion of the unveiling of Abraham Lincoln's statue. There was much eloquence, punctuated by lofty idealism. Two years ago, it would have filled me with elation; that evening I only smiled incredulously. I believe I was not the only one who did it.

This, however, must be a temporary phase. No people have ever lived or could live without faith—

faith in the ultimate triumph of "the good." Men would not fight so grimly as they are doing to-day if there were not deep down in their hearts some spark of that fire which refuses to be extinguished. It matters little how one defines "the good." As a matter of fact, no one has yet done it with any show of completeness. All the same, everybody knows it, has felt it, and can understand what it is like; for the joy and glow it brings are unmistakable. It may look very much like despair, yet out of such is the finest hope and faith born.

Another thing which would, sooner or later, have made the old world impossible is the habit which craves for constant sensation, which appreciates the week-ends of life and not life as a whole. If holidays are the only periods which people enjoy, it must mean either riotous living or a life of slavery more galling than the slaves of the dark ages ever knew. When a man has been taught by nearly all the agencies that count, not forgetting the Press, that one day out of seven is the only one when he could be expected to be really free and happy, then it follows, as night follows the day, that he must be overwhelmingly unhappy; at any rate, very much discontented.

In the last resort it all turns on how you are taught—or how you teach yourself—to look at things. The German was taught that his race was a superior race, divinely appointed to rule the world. He believed it until the inexorable logic of facts made his vision clearer. Something similar is happening on a much wider scale. "Get rich, squander, enjoy; that's where happiness lies." It does not lie there,

because it is physically impossible not to take account of moral and spiritual considerations. And the result is a war greater than ever was fought is raging in the hearts and minds of men. It should clarify our vision just as the Kaiser's war cleansed to some extent the German mentality.

It may be that nothing is new under the sun, but then we forget so easily. "With the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat and—find happiness" is a truism repeated by all the great sages of the world. When people come to realise that labour, be it corporeal or mental, according to one's capacities, is as much a source of happiness as relaxation, so that the six days of labour and one of rest shall give each its due meed of satisfaction, then we shall have reached much nearer the solution of the many problems that now baffle us. Happily this is no mere academic question. A step in that direction has already been taken. In any event, the dignity of labour has been recognised. Of course, it is absurd to confine that term to mere manual work. Even the rankest Bolshevik has to recognise and has recognised the rightful place of mental work. If not, Messrs. Lenin and Trotsky should have been out with a spade or a hatchet on their shoulders, instead of a pen in their hands. That there is much wild talk and irresponsible action few sensible people would dispute; but these somehow seem to be inevitable. What great political or social reform was ever achieved without furious recriminations and untoward incidents? Even the philosophic calm of the scientific world is disturbed by such ebullition, when a new theory which knocks an old one on the

head is attempted to be proved. It is all in the game of life.

One of the most hopeful signs of the times is the motto "Workmen of the world, unite!" It may be revolutionary in its tendency, may have been suggested by personal interests, and may be intended to apply, for the present, to only one section of society; yet it marks a very important stage forward on the path of universal fellow-feeling. It certainly means the weakening of the extreme type of "nationalism" which has been responsible for so much of recent human suffering. Our age has been prolific in the most astounding discoveries and inventions, annihilating time and distance, and promising to bring the remotest countries into intimate touch with one another. How, then, can the self-centred and exclusive spirit of "nationalism" long endure? It did yeoman service in the cause of civilisation by creating a bond between men living within certain definite geographical limits. It thus provided security and a means to further development. What feudalism did, in the Middle Ages, by way of providing a rallying point, nationalism has done in modern times. But we have outlived that stage. Perhaps a century hence people will marvel at the anarchy that could not be controlled except by a homage paid to a geographical division of the earth. The very formulation of a League of Nations is an acknowledgment that nationalism, as we knew it, is on the wane.

Lastly, to suggest that science by itself, no matter how magnificent may be its quota to the sum total of "civilisation," can make men happy is to lose the end in the means. A man may feel very uncomfort-

able—even miserable—if he has a pair of ill-fitting boots on, but it would be going too far to infer that human happiness depends on boots. Aeronautics, wireless, and the other manifold advances of science may be very valuable adjuncts to happiness (or quite the reverse if people so choose it), but until the mental equilibrium is there to work with all these props of “a better world” they would be to little purpose. Some of the finest periods in history are those in which material comforts were at their lowest, and the reverse is also equally true; some of the drabbest times were those when men possessed an abundance of the “good things of life.” It does not, however, follow that poverty is to be sought, though it had its day of glorification, nor that riches are to be shunned. What really matters is the elimination of the horror of poverty, and at the same time of the passion for affluence. It is no mere idle dream; it has been done and has worked admirably.

TAHER S. MAHOMADI.

14, *Gilston Road, South Kensington, S.W. 10, Aug. 31.*

LOST LOYALTY

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph.*

SIR,—The majority of your correspondents have determined that this new world is still the old universe, but is there not a momentous difference which has not received their general recognition? The evidences of that loyalty which formed the strength and beauty of the character of the individual as

well as the nation in pre-war years, are surely difficult to find in these days of peace. Not to exceed the due limitations of your valuable columns, brief reference to three departments of life may suffice: (1) politics, (2) letters, and (3) labour.

1. The Government consists of the members elected by the voters—how does the electorate evince its loyalty to its chosen representatives? Does it grant them, by word or letter, the generous help of its own wisdom and experience; does it inspire them with its prayers, or does it hamper and harass them on every possible occasion, and discourage and defy them with each opportunity? If, as our friends of the esoteric cult aver, lives are modified—if not made, by the thoughts of their associates and contemporaries, verily the best and most ennobling thoughts should be cultivated for those in “high places.”

2. Literature—can the lost loyalty be discovered there? The popular productions, the present “best sellers,” are those which reveal and ridicule the most sacred and hallowed relationships: the intimate touches and tones of marriage, friendship, and office. The very privileges that were expected to confer honour seem simply to have provoked the cheapest of cheap advertisement.

3. Then Labour—that biggest factor in up-to-date considerations—is loyally preserved here? Loyalty to his own ability, his chief's interests, does that find illustration in the average workman? “I will do my very best for my own character's development as well as the firm's reputation,” is not quite a popular proposition.

Realities, however unfavourable, command recognition, and sooner or later it must be acknowledged that the loyalty which meant so much to the Britisher and the Empire (of which he is a trustee) has been grievously shattered, if not temporarily obliterated, by the cataclysm of the Great War. The ideals he cherished have been swept away, and he is falling a prey to the marauding atheism and anarchy that have won such ghastly triumphs elsewhere. Can anything restore that lost saving influence? The young Athenian, in the Temple of Agraule, took his oath, "I swear to fight to the last breath for the interests of Religion and the Homeland, and I shall remain steadfastly bound to the faith of my fathers." Might not a similar resolve to return to the faith of his fathers prove the one thing needful for the Britisher to-day? Nothing less could suffice for his grave perils and his glorious possibilities.—Yours faithfully,

MABEL KATHERINE PHILLIPS, LL.A.

Carisbrooke, Caerau Road, Newport, Mon.

MERCY TO THE UNDER-DOG

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—When the history of the last ten years comes to be written, Englishmen of the day will be able to look with legitimate and pardonable pride upon the inheritance of many admirable qualities, exhibited to the world by their fathers and grandfathers in the second decade of the twentieth century. But there is one of the greatest of the virtues which

they will look for with anxiety in vain. I mean the great outstanding virtue of mercy.

Now, I desire, in very few words, to put in an earnest plea for mercy to the under-dog, the man in prison, who has somehow missed his mark. The prisoner, I once heard it said by a prison missionary of long experience, is always helpless, occasionally hopeless, but rarely, if ever, worthless. I am confident that this question, once raised, will be taken up by some "Great Heart," and not allowed to be shelved until some relief has been definitely granted.

Every nation, even to the remotest period to which historical records bear witness, has been in the habit of signalling great events in her history by gracious acts of Royal clemency and amnesty to prisoners. We have—and the whole civilised world has—just emerged from the throes of the greatest world upheaval ever experienced by man, from the literal and veritable Armageddon. The old world is dead, and, rising from its ashes, a new world is being born; and England, as my knowledge goes, has failed in her peace rejoicings to grant any general remission of sentences to well-conducted prisoners who have suffered and endured.

Are not these men to be allowed their chance in the new world? Is England willing, in the greatest moments of her national life, deliberately to neglect these helpless but not worthless sons and daughters of the mistress of nations? Many have "done their bit" during the war, and their fathers, sons, and brothers have made the supreme sacrifice, as well as in other ways playing their part with credit in this great transformation. I will be content to open the

question, without any suggestion as to the details of its fulfilment. I trust that my plea will be taken up and pressed forward to a satisfactory end by some large-hearted and abler advocate than my humble self.—Yours truly,

BERNARD ABINGER.

7, Bow Street, Covent Garden, W.C. 2, Sept. 1.

THE POWER OF THE MASSES

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Although the arguments put forward by Sir Sidney Low are sound, his deductions bear that inevitable appearance of bias on the side to which he belongs. Many thinking people are speculating upon the present world unrest, and endeavouring to deal out wise words from the comfortable position of an easy chair. To my mind the matter is plain. Leaders and prominent persons of the world's old political parties may dub the present social movements by every unholy "ism" they can find; it will never arrest the progress of the development they preach against. One must not forget that the masses now are hardly of the same kind as were ground down in the early 'seventies. It was this grinding process, when the masses were mostly improvident, if not worse, which gave the opportunity for the foundation of the fortunes which to-day maintain our captains of industry. It was also this process which made it necessary to introduce a better factory system, when also prices were cut and cut until the poor could barely maintain themselves.

Those were the days before the unions. The workers were trusting in their employers, but were unprotected. What was the result? Only the strongest succeeded in dragging themselves and those dependent upon them from the hands of starvation and death, many, alas! only to exist as wrecks, broken in constitution, under the lingering processes of tuberculosis.

It is the children of these workers who have dared to strive to reform their lives. It is these people who have known what the lack of unions means, and it is not much use lecturing on the horrors of this or that "ism" just because it is inimical to the interests of a certain class. The masses have learned their power, and how to wield it. They were first provident and then organised, and now comes the final stage. You may cry unto the heavens for mercy, but he who is not ready to give it is hardly likely to expect it, and the taskmaster of the 'seventies has only shifted his responsibilities to his children, as have also the workers. The war has helped the workers, as Sir Sidney Low states, and it is only to be hoped that truth and justice, religion and piety will soon be more firmly established among us.—
Yours faithfully,

CHAS. SWINGLAND.

63, *Dumbreck Road, Eltham.*

THE EVOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL MORALITY

BY BISHOP WELLDON, DEAN OF DURHAM

It is necessary to conceive humanity, in accordance with Lessing's great idea, as one man. As man is born, grows, matures, develops, and achieves, so does humanity; and as he at last fades and dies, so, too, it may be inferred, will humanity. Neither of the individual nor of the race is the progress physical only; it is also moral, intellectual, and spiritual.

When human history opens, every man is or may be the enemy of every other man. *Hostis*, as Cicero says, meant "stranger" before it meant "enemy"; for every stranger was an enemy. At a later time tribes were always at war, as they are in barbarous countries to-day. Cities, too, like the Italian Republics, were always at war. There were intervals of peace when the tribes or the cities were temporarily exhausted. But the law of society was not peace; it was war.

Slowly but surely, as civilisation advanced, the individual ceased to be militant. He gave up the practice of carrying arms. He was not always on the look-out for injuries for which he must exact revenge. He began to treat his neighbour with equity and sympathy. If a difference arose between him and his neighbour, it was not settled by a vendetta;

it was referred to judicial arbitration. The courts of law, which pronounce judgment upon civil and criminal cases in all Christian lands, are the abiding witnesses to the spirit which appeals not to might, but to right. Above all, individuals abandoned the habit of force or fraud for the mutual consideration of gentlemen who may be said to love their neighbours as themselves, in the sense of acknowledging that their neighbours possess rights as well as themselves, and that they are bound to perform duties as well as their neighbours. The dependence of individuals upon justice, and, as consequent upon it, the maintenance of peace among individuals, has gradually passed to the wider life of cities. Nobody supposes that one city of a civilised nation will go to war with another. The lower patriotism of the city is regularly subordinated to the higher patriotism, which expresses the obligation of every city, as of every citizen, to the State or the Empire.

NATIONS AND THE MORAL LAW

But the law of civilised Christian morals has been curiously slow in asserting its supremacy over the life of nations. The methods of barbarism have to a large extent survived in international relations. One nation has looked upon another as its natural enemy. Not much more than a hundred years ago Nelson told his seamen to hate a Frenchman as they hated the devil. European history has been blood-stained during long centuries by a succession of wars among the peoples. Education, science, religion have been equally impotent to create and sustain

an honourable, pacific, national character. If France was the most offending nation in the seventeenth century, it was Germany which was the most offending nation in the nineteenth century. But ever since the time of Frederick the Great German policy has been corrupted by militarism. The diplomatists of Germany acted—I am afraid they were not alone in acting—upon the principle, sarcastically enunciated by Sir Henry Wotton, that “an ambassador” was “an honest man sent to lie abroad for his State.” As Frederick the Great deceived the Empress Maria Theresa on the matter of Silesia, so Bismarck goaded the French to war in 1870 by his falsification of the Emperor’s telegram at Ems. Because Germany had become a nation in arms, other European peoples became, or tended to become, nations in arms. All, or nearly all, Europe was a standing army. But nowhere except in Germany was the gospel so nakedly preached by military writers, such as Bernhardi, and by professors of history, such as Treitzschke, that the Christian moral law possesses no relevancy to national ambition. It was broadly and boldly declared that every citizen owed a supreme duty to the State; that whatever the State, or the Emperor as the head of the State, ordered to be done, a citizen was bound to do; and that he was justified in violating all the laws of God and man out of patriotic devotion to the gospel of “Deutschland über Alles.” The world has learnt now at an unspeakable cost what the German doctrine of the State means to civilisation.

But terrible as the last war was, the next war will be far more terrible. Mr. Lloyd George has gone so far as to prophesy that the next war, if it breaks

out, may prove to be the end of civilisation. The instruments of destruction will be multiplied in diversity and energy; they will hurl destruction broadcast from the air no less—indeed, far more—than by sea and by land, and Christian society, fortified as it has been by the progress of science, may in the end, by the progress of science, be destroyed.

It is in these circumstances that statesmen in all civilised countries are coming to feel the imperative need for a return, as of individuals, so of communities, to the Christian moral law. It is necessary to curb the aggressive military spirit, to limit the size of armies, to emancipate diplomacy from injustice and intrigue, to ordain that the nations shall treat each other in the spirit of Christian gentlemen, to establish the predominance of the nations generally over one ambitious and unscrupulous nation. There must be an end of military despotism. Treaties of insurance and re-insurance, if they are made, must be known and read of all men. Diplomats, instead of telling lies in the supposed interest of their own countries, must speak the truth in the interest of humanity. It must be held to be an axiom of civilisation that the same morality as regulates, or ought to regulate, individual lives should be made applicable to international relations. Civilised humanity, in fact, must conform itself to the ethics of a gentleman and a Christian.

THE ONLY POLICY

The League of Nations is an instrument designed to moralise the life of nations. It owes its initiation

no less than its realisation to the strong will of President Wilson. The object of the League of Nations, as declared in the Covenant attached to it, is "to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace, and to secure by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war; by the prescription of open, honourable, and just relations between nations; by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments; and by the maintenance of justice and scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another." What is this object but the Christianisation of international policy? It involves the limitation of armaments, the reference of international differences to arbitration, the institution of a High Court of Justice among the nations, the establishment of safeguards to ensure peace, the punishment of States which offend against the League, the regulation of labour and commerce in all countries, and the perpetual vigilance of the League over such moral questions as affect the welfare of humanity. It is scarcely too much to say that, if the object of the League of Nations could be accomplished, the world would become a new world.

The League was welcomed, when it was proposed, with general enthusiasm. But of late the difficulties in the way of consentient action among the nations have tended to create a feeling of disappointment about it in many minds. Yet the two clear facts remain—(1) that there must be an end of international warfare, or the doom of civilisation will be sealed; (2) that there is no prospect of putting an end to international

warfare except through some such agency as the League of Nations. It is here that public opinion becomes all-important. If the citizens of all civilised nations are in their hearts determined to stay the plague of international warfare, they can, and will, so powerfully strengthen the hands of their statesmen as to create, by the demand of a just international sentiment, the execution of the reforms which the League of Nations purports to effect. It is here, too, that the Christian Churches may find their signal opportunity in erecting and elevating public opinion upon the basis of the Christian moral law. The Churches would be irresistible, if they could speak with one voice. But in such degree as they act or speak in concert will their influence upon the life of nations be accentuated. To unite the Churches and thereby to unite the nations, to quicken and strengthen public opinion by the authority of the Christian conscience, to inspire in all nations the spirit of justice and equity, and, as far as possible, to ally them in co-operation for the peace and progress of humanity—that is the policy of the League of Nations; and it is the only policy which will or can ensure in the coming centuries the permanent welfare of mankind.

THE PRODUCTIVE UNIT

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—It is a new world (not necessarily a better), because the main element in the organisation of the recent world, the industrial system, is breaking down irremediably. Just as the feudal organisation on a

military and territorial basis passed away, so the recent organisation on the basis of exploiting natural resources for profit is now passing away. Some other basis of organisation will arise, and to that extent we shall find, or make, a new world. This may easily be worse than the old; it will be better only if it is built by love of God and of the neighbour, instead of by cupidity. But if it is to be good it will not grow of itself; it is a matter for courageous and instructed organisation.

The family is said to be the social unit, but it is rarely the productive unit. The productive unit is a little autonomous principality, such as the landed estate or the farm or the factory, involving several or many families under one rule and using one property. That productive unit is the key to the whole question, and has to be worked out afresh, in view of the breakdown of the recent system, and of the new claims which the untiring Christian spirit now makes for every person. This is an entirely practical matter. Can we then extend the family principle to cover the productive unit? Various laudable attempts, of course, are being made to modify existing industrial units in this direction, but there is no reason to believe that these will ever satisfy the workers, who are out for satisfactions of which they have not yet even guessed the name. But we have the historic example of a vast system in which the family principle was in fact co-extensive with the productive unit. It is by no means easy to say how much we may or may not learn, for our present purpose, from the monastery, regarded as an economic unit; but that institution certainly possessed in the

highest degree the chief elements which we need for the organisation of industry, that is to say, of life.

We shall be told that the life of the monastery was the life of faith, that its treasure was in Heaven before it was on earth, that Christ was present among his lowly brothers; and, again, that there is not now in the world such faith and love as will hold secular people together in brotherhood, or make the common day's work into one mere devotion. All this is very true. Work is now perishing throughout the world for lack of faith, hope, and love; and these are perishing for lack of embodiment in appropriate life, labour, and institutions. It is a vicious circle. The social body dies for want of soul, and the soul for want of incorporation through the entire body of human activities. This is the one key to the immense confusion and disability of our day. We have long separated soul from body, the inspiration of life from life's complex technique, with the result that the inspiration has become nebulous and ineffective; and the technique, uncoordinated to man's chief end, has run riot and has well-nigh ruined us.

The remedy for all this is simple, obvious, and practicable, and to some of us appears a prime duty. It is to make the family principle co-extensive with the productive unit—to establish here and there a little community devoted first, as the monasteries were devoted, to the highest development of personal and social life, and therefore devoted to all the means and skilled activities of life in their due place and proportion. We all know what is needed. Production, production, and again production, of all things

of use and beauty. Elimination of every kind of waste—of materials, of expenditure, of time and labour, of skill and capacity; the waste by individual competition; the waste of life and talent unstimulated and undirected, lonely and hopeless, without opportunity unfulfilled. Restoration of every kind of good and honest work to its due dignity and social esteem. Security for the worker and for his children in all the conditions of the fullest, happiest, and most accomplished life. Leisure with companionship, and with the means of knowledge, art, and technical tradition. Peace and gaiety, instead of unrest, anxiety, and thirst for distractions.

But, as in every other practical matter, we must organise to these ends, which are perfectly and now obtainable. As you cannot cross the seas except you build a ship and organise a ship's company, so you cannot enter a more fruitful era unless you build a community designed in accordance with its specific purpose and take service in it. Your organisation, directed singly to the highest development of human life, and employing thereto all the means and activities of life, may remain hidden for a little, but will presently be copied everywhere. There is only one way to make a better world. It is to make, wherever possible, even on the smallest scale, a social life which shall be completely and conspicuously expressive of the love of God and of the neighbour.—Your obedient servant,

G. SANDEMAN.

Henstridge, Somerset.

EVOLUTION AND FAITH

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Humanity is, as Dean Inge affirms, always on the march; but its course is not that of a vicious circle. Under the alternating action of the evolutionary forces of variation and standardisation, the direction is reversed from time to time, but the impulse is ever upward. The return is not to the point of departure. At each successive cycle a higher plane of development is attained, as in the case of the spiral track of a mountain railway. The scientific world, including many divines, has long accepted the theory of the evolution of man from lowliest origins. Viewing the progress in the past, through endless æons of ages, to higher and more elaborate types, there is no place for pessimism. Indeed, men of science, formerly regarded as sceptics, are now the true believers in the spirit that makes for righteousness. It is no real reproach to be called a professional optimist. We live by faith. The phenomena of hypnotic suggestion prove that without a firm belief that a movement can be made the limbs are paralysed. In mundane matters there is a continual flux. It was a paradox of Heracleitos that no one could step twice into the same river. The old world is passing away; all things are becoming new.

The source of power lies no longer with the privileged classes. It has been deliberately transferred into the hands of the masses, who are now bent on exercising it. But the men of England are sound and true of heart. Although they may modify some of our delightfully archaic institutions and remedy some crying evils, they

will not grossly abuse their power. It is fortunate that in this time of trial and transition we have called to our aid the moderating influence of womanhood.

Dean Inge, while affirming his desire for the League of Nations, damns it with difficulties. There is, however, no reason why an international authority should not eventually abolish war, just as law suppressed duelling in the settlement of personal disputes. The Dean jibes at the efforts to prevent the denationalisation of America and Australia by the incursion of coloured races. He is evidently unacquainted with the quality of the Australian workman. Despite high wages, his labour is comparatively both cheap and efficient. The Eastern races may be "addicted to the vices of industry and plain living," but they have unmentionable practices with which we do not desire our people to be contaminated. It would be a sad day for Christendom were we to witness a Christian community overrun and supplanted by heathen hordes.—Your obedient servant,

JOHN A. COCKBURN.

Dean's Hill, Harrietsham, Sept. 4.

PSEUDO-SCIENTIFIC "FACTS"

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—In your issue of September 6 Mr. A. Althouse, an instructor of youth, says that he does not discuss religious questions or opinions with his pupils. What he does is to train their thinking faculties by presenting them with certain prepositions which he invites them to regard as "points of positive science" or "scientific facts."

Let us glance at these "facts" as set forth by the teacher.

1. "There is no limit to space or to the universe."

This is not a "scientific fact." It is an assumption accepted by many mathematicians and physicists, and convenient for working purposes. Science has neither proved nor disproved it.

2. "Time is non-existent."

This is not "positive science," but controversial metaphysics. It may or may not be a reasonable expression of the conceptions it implies. Some philosophers think so; many others do not.

3. "There is no beginning or ending to this world or the universe."

This, again, is only an assumption or hypothesis. It may be true or false. Science does not know, perhaps can never know.

4. "At present we are matter and immaterial, next we shall be earth or powder, next gas, then again earth, then matter, and again beings; simply transformations."

Mr. Althouse's pupils can hardly require to be told by him that "dust we are and unto dust we return." They perhaps also know that this "dust," and all the other material elements of our bodies, will continue to exist in new forms and combinations. That these will ultimately be reconstituted as "beings" they may believe or hope; but it is no more a "scientific fact" than the Fall and Redemption of Man, or any of those other religious doctrines which Mr. Althouse is too scientific to discuss.

5. "They must realise that some billions of planets must be, like our planet, inhabited."

They are not entitled to "realise" anything of the sort. All the astronomers and physicists can say is that life may, and probably does, occur beyond the limits of our earth. They do not know that it exists on "billions" of other planets, and cannot be certain that it exists on one; nor, if it does exist, can they know, or even imagine, the form in which it manifests itself. They have not the least ground for supposing that any planet or star is provided with "inhabitants" resembling the living creatures found on our own. There may be, though we do not know there is, life in Mars; it is in the highest degree unlikely that there are men.

It appears, then, that Mr. Althouse's "points of positive science" are merely speculations or hypotheses. Some of them may ultimately be found valid, some may be dismissed as untenable. At present they are at the best "guesses at truth." They may be good guesses or bad guesses. But it is surely unjustifiable to lay them before young students as "scientific facts," endorsed and approved by "positive" knowledge. We do not want to exchange the dogmatism of the sectarian preacher for the dogmatism of the scientific or pseudo-scientific dabbler.—Yours faithfully,

SIDNEY LOW.

London, Sept. 7.

AN EXODUS FROM EUROPE?

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Dean Inge, the most incisive and courageous spiritual philosopher of our generation, is coming into

his kingdom. Derided for years in press, pulpit, and council as the incarnation of morbid pessimism, he has triumphed by the tireless reiteration of warnings that are only too surely finding justification in the unfolding decrees of destiny. The jeremiads that were the jests of yesterday are the revelations of to-day. Melitus and Anytus are amongst his converts; Aristophanes is deserted of his audience, while we, the multitude, are gathering stones in the roadway for his detractors. The substance of the dean's letter is a plea for the Gospel of Christ. To avert the total collapse of humanity he advocates a practical adoption of Christ's teachings. It is not a new idea, though its advocacy at the moment is probably fraught with an unprecedented significance.

There seems, however, a suspicion of weakness, not in the substance, but the form, of the dean's appeal. The strain of his grim researches has apparently led him into assessing our spiritual gravity with the fluid of the very materialism he is at pains to indict. Such a procedure, by attaching to spirituality an economic responsibility analogous to that with which every secular system is invested, is misleading. The dean is frank of criticism and plain of counsel. I am emboldened to submit to him a blunt question: Does he believe it possible to establish the Gospel (*i. e.* the laws) of Christ in our midst without a disruption of the Mosaic system on which the order and cohesion of the community are founded? Therein lies the pith of the whole matter. The law of Moses is the law of every civilised quarter of the globe. It is indestructible, unchanging save in its gradual secularisation. Its

ordinances have evoked the admiration of statesmen, philosophers, and jurists in all ages. It is the compendium of human equity; the finite adjudicator in all communal concerns. We unconsciously epitomise its balance of interests in the words retaliation, reprisal, indemnification. Christ Himself succinctly defined its governing policy as an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. On the other hand, the law of Christ has never been the law of any country or collective race. One may go further and say it has never even permeated any system of national law; its operations, at most, having been sporadic and eccentric. As one amongst the restless millions craving for guidance, I would ask how the dean, as a preliminary to the introduction of Christ's teaching, would first deal with our existing system? How is the Mosaic thesis to be supplanted by, or reconciled to, its antithesis? Christ counselled good for evil; Mosaicism sanctions evil for evil. Christ advocated the forgiveness and succouring of enemies; Mosaicism has a stern schedule of indemnifications for injuries, and is complacent (for instance) when a popular bishop publicly approves of the abandonment of a drowning airship crew (of enemies).

The British Empire, like British jurisprudence, is founded upon the Mosaic code. Our guardianship of world-wide possessions is maintained by the same rules of equity, and it is our pride that they obtain to its furthestmost limits. Christ has ruled war and every form of physical retaliation outside the pale of His doctrine. Can the British Empire or any League of Nations rule out war? If so, what is to be the basis of its enforcement of unacceptable decrees? The

more one examines the rival panaceas of statecraft the more one sees in each a mere variant of some old and discredited formula. The lock is often changed, but the door is always fast.

I see but one method of affording Christ's Gospel a foothold in our midst, and that is so little likely to be adopted that its delineation may merely satisfy a transient curiosity. Britain forms one of a huddled group of nations whose very contiguity to each other breeds jealousies, susceptibilities, and misunderstandings that could never obtain between remoter nations. We have alternately or collectively been fighting Scandinavia, Denmark, the Netherlands, France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Austria, Russia, and Turkey for a thousand years. Peace treaties have been signed by contending Powers in half of the prominent cities of Europe. The issues of these struggles have been neither permanence of peace nor integrity of territory to the belligerents. They have brought neither settled conditions nor settled friendships. With us, as with our too-near neighbours, the ally of to-day has been the foe of to-morrow. These interminable broils have meant to Britain alone the sacrifice of millions of lives and thousands of millions in treasure, to recount only the material debit. And for what? Has Britain any interests in Europe commensurate with her appalling sacrifices? Common-sense answers, No. The interests of Britain in Europe, the cockpit of her wars and troubles, are comparatively negligible. The interests of Britain lie in her Colonies on the other side of the world. The wars that have outlawed her Christianity, decimated her manhood, and

piled up an incalculable debt, have concerned nothing in the world but the inviolability of a petty little island already too small for its population and three-parts exhausted of its subterranean resources. On this beloved dust-heap Britannia, owner of a fourth of the earth's surface, is content to lie bleeding to death. The cost of protecting the little island has always been high, and will steadily mount higher (see estimates) until a revolution intervenes.

"But," says common-sense, "if Britain's interests in Europe are so small and the cost of them is draining her life-blood away, why does she not evacuate Europe and spread herself over her vast Colonies, where she will find hundreds of acres for each one she leaves behind, untapped mines, untouched forests, pure air, freedom, health, peace, and an opportunity for practising Christianity that she has never known before? She has absolutely no future in Europe, internally or externally. She is spending, and must continue to spend, hundreds of millions on armaments to ensure a security that might be threatened or overthrown at any moment. How much better to lay out this waste of wealth, material and labour in setting up a new home on the other side of the globe! From a rough calculation of shipping tonnage it would take—what? Twenty years—what does a year less or more signify? Certain it is that most of those alive to-day would be living to taste the firstfruits of Britain's new world and new faith. What a legacy for posterity! How different from the old (European) legacy of blood-feud, jealousy, fear, and distrust! And think of an automatic settlement of the Irish question without the breaking of a single head!

Is there anything of practical value in the casual suggestion of common-sense, or do its simplicity, cheapness, and thoroughness constitute an insuperable trio of drawbacks? Do we yearn for more Marnes, Monses, Jutlands, Gallipolis, Mespots, etc., or is there enough of the plain God-fearing primæval husbandman left in the national character to determine us in a united effort for something worthier of our faith and understanding? True, there is nothing about *en masse* emigrations in the Mosaic code; but, after all, did not the great founder of that *lex talionis* himself lead a nation from one continent into another—from misery, oppression, and strife, into a land of peace and plenty? May we not read one of the Almighty's eternal parables on that far-off exodus?—Yours obediently,

W. MOVIN NENDICK.

London, Sept. 2.

A MIDDLE-CLASS VIEW

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—It is amusing to glance down the list of distinguished men who have promised articles on the subject of “Is it a New World?” The question arises as to whether they, in particular, are in a position to answer the riddle of the centuries in a satisfactory manner, except to those who think as they do, viz. from the intellectual point of view. Since intellect is being so worthily represented in the articles on “Is it a New World?” it is fit that other classes of people besides the intellectual, should be able to air their views on the matter.

The particular opinion I venture to express, the only one I know, represents—at least I believe it does—that of the overwhelming majority of people, the Middle Class—middle class, of course, in a mental, not social sense—the great, big, stupid, kindly, brutal crowd of men and women having, as Ruskin once declared of the British public, “the stolidity of a megatherium with the ticklishness of an infant.”

We all think alike. That is to say, there are three aspects of thought with all of us: the purely material thought, which concerns itself simply with bodily needs and desires; the intellectual thought, which busies itself both in the domain of spirit and matter; and, last but not least, that spiritual thought, which, rising above both intellect and matter, common-sense and desire, expresses itself in love, unselfishness, and noble deeds. The world is just old or new according to our vision of it. The great law, wholly or partially hidden from us, which moves the whole of creation, works on, steady and unchanging, and a new world, founded on the old one, gradually unfolds to us as we gain a clearer perception of what life means. We great, untutored, slow-thinking, steady Middle Class, know this, unconsciously perhaps, but unerringly, and we shall win through by the force of those qualities which have saved the world in many a dark and threatening hour.

It is only in times of stress and agony, such as we have recently passed through, that we are fully aware of the tremendous power of love and unselfishness. In the calm currents of ordinary life we pass unnoticed the thousand and one acts of mercy and goodness which rise to the surface as glorious deeds

in the time of war and trouble. This it is which renews and makes the old world new. Knowledge—mere material knowledge—does not advance us morally. Clean, healthy bodies won't and don't make clean minds. All the beauty of music and art are lost on the dull ear and eye. Law and intellectual training may make a good human machine, but they will not necessarily make a good citizen or an honest neighbour.

It is through Individualism, not through Socialism, that the salvation of the world will come; and it is in the Middle Class that Individualism has the freest play, unhampered by theory, precedent, and dogmatism. Electricity, steam, air waves were all existent in the old world. The understanding of their use made apparently a new world, but it was only in appearance. The facts remained unaltered. A greater perception of truth to-day will leave the world unchanged, but will so alter our outlook as to make our former views unrecognisable. Nothing can be new, except in a relative sense, but we want to exchange pessimism for optimism, indifference for morality, the negative for the positive.

All the same, there is progress, there is order in the universe; and if we had less pride of intellect, less mental intolerance, we should have a clearer vision of the old world through an apparently new one.—Yours, etc.,

H. MARCUS.

Sept. 2.

THE GOLDEN RULE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—In the splendid series of articles now appearing in the *Daily Telegraph*, one or two stand out conspicuous for their sane grasp of the world's need. Amongst these is that of Dr. Horton, who has succeeded in making a clear cut through the mass of vague and bewildering generalities which lead to nothing, and seem always on the verge of expressing something which never gets expressed.

It is nothing but the truth to state that no one objects to a more equal distribution of wealth save those who already have the lion's share, and no one fears giving the workers a better status save those who are clinging precariously to privileged positions. It is, indeed, an "agony for the wealthy to contemplate a more equal distribution of wealth," but it is as nothing to the long-drawn-out agony of countless workers by whose sweat the "accumulation and possession of large personal wealth" has been made possible. If the heads of all the great industrial concerns of this country would sit down and devote some serious measure of time and consideration to the origins and methods which have led to the rise and predominance of their businesses, and face the facts as they are revealed, an ounce of undiluted goodwill would leaven the lump and point the way to industrial and social peace. Agriculture, the textile industries, the mines, to name but a few, have been largely built on the sweat and tears of men and women, the aching backs, strained eyes, jagged nerves, dust-poisoned lungs, of previous generations

of workers, and the stultification and permanent ill-health of even quite young children. The question for each one of us to-day is this: "How much owest thou?"

Dr. Horton is right: Labour is not clamouring for revenge, nor "driven by the demon of greed," but is urged on by a determination born of the loftiest idealism since the Divine Carpenter gave humanity the Sermon on the Mount. But now, as then, the rich "go away sorrowful, for they have many possessions." I venture to join my lesser appeal to that of others to take the workers into the industries as partners and not as "hands." Give to all a living wage, and let every one take out of a concern in exact proportion to what he (or she) puts in. Throw open the universities to all who can pass a modified "responsions," and let us see in every child, whatever his birth, a potential leader of his people. The result would be to discover tucked away in our slums, and cowering over our ledgers a vast, even a colossal amount of talent, key-holders to the unlocked problems of science, enrichers of art and literature, music and philosophy, tongues unstrung to sing the songs of the new world.

None of these things should depend on wealth or privilege, and in so far as they do, the nation is the poorer.

Lest my appeal should utterly fail may I say, personally, that I have been prosperous, and I have been poor, and have also stood on the more comfortable ground between the two, as I do to-day. Born to others working for me, in turn I have worked hard for others under conditions of the most degrading

wage slavery. I am employing others, and humbly experimenting in the Golden Rule. I am much the richer for my mid-way experiences; by it I have learned that "The life is more than meat and the body than raiment."—Yours, etc.,

K. S. M. TAYLOR.

Glendalough, Ryde, I.W., Sept. 2.

A SPIRITUAL UPHEAVAL

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—There is a considerable agreement amongst your contributors that the solution of world troubles is spiritual—that any real progress can only come through greater unselfishness. It is not a new diagnosis, nor a new prescription. The Master first effectually suggested the remedy 2000 years ago, but its application has been slow. His simple remedy has been overlaid by theocracies, theologies, State religions—all religions of authority—until it is scarce recognisable as that religion of the Spirit, which truly it is. It has been allied to wealth; it has sought to crush the conscience; it has looked on passively at social evil. But now it is awake—at least on paper—as the Lambeth report shows; and if that report can get translated into action all may be well.

Why do the spiritual forces, churches and chapels, not get hold of the majority of the people instead of the minority? Because in the industrial world the capitalists distrust the workers and the workers distrust the capitalists. And what is the core of this distrust? Simply this, that the rule has been

to conceal profits, with the result that the capitalist knows what he gets and what his employees get, but the employees know their own remuneration only. Hence distrust, fighting, strikes. But the Kingdom of Heaven demands no secrets, but revelation on the house-tops.

A system of industry which permits millionaires is bad. The capitalist is powerless without the workers; then let his enterprise be open, candid, and all details revealed. Let the employer take an agreed share of these profits and let the employees take the remainder. Why should a millionaire have such a surplus that he cannot possibly apply it on any rational personal or family expenditure? Why should he be able to pose as a great philanthropist, contributor to free libraries, endower of churches, prospective M.P., etc.? Indeed, cases are quite intelligible in which capital having received its fair profit and labour its fair remuneration, the surplus should go either to the State, or, on the co-operative principle, be distributed to customers, or best of all, result in a diminution of the charge for the commodity produced. Such cases are monopolies, literal or virtual, which pay fabulous dividends or create capital out of profits to appear to absorb such dividends.

In all the post-war turmoil, like many of your contributors, I see new ideas of a more exalted order struggling to be born and to get applied. The upheaval is really spiritual, though it does not always appear so. So many are obsessed by the materialistic side of the improvements alone that the mainspring of action is unobserved. But the leaders are sound at heart by whatever name labelled. For example,

frequent strikes for impossible wages will soon die of inanition. Labour will soon perceive by an inevitable reaction that the total produce of labour available for wages has to be divided amongst the total labourers, and that if some take too many spoonfuls the others must go short. Then section will fight against section until common sense federates all labour with the object of seeing that equity rules the distribution amongst them all. So with direct action. Labour will soon perceive its folly—that it is a two-edged sword—that it is subversive of democracy—that it is subversive even of Socialism. It seeks the sectional and not the common good, and Demos will slay it.

To make a real advance, false notions of success have to be overturned. Even the Sunday school books have shown that men have been materially prosperous because they were morally good. But the proposition has as many facts to overthrow it as to support it. “Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you”; not, however, in lumps, or millions, for the more spiritual a man becomes the less his material needs. So, like Dante, a man should prefer to be a great poet to a great emperor; he should exalt Demosthenes before Alexander, Marcus Aurelius before Cæsar, Luther before Napoleon, Venizelos before Constantine or Ferdinand, and President Wilson before the war lords. It is because so many perceive these true values and are devoting their minds to their accomplishment that we shall move *per saltum* towards a better world.—Yours, etc.,

A. W. CRAMPTON, F.S.I.

Ilford, Sept. 6.

PATRIOTISM AND SOCIALISM

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The conclusion forced upon those who are brought into pretty close touch with various classes and occupations is, I think, that failing a moral revolution that would replace the incentive of private gain by the incentive of social service, so that a man will do his best for the general welfare rather than for himself alone, a Socialistic revolution is drawing very near. We can see its dangers. It would be fatal, we believe, to liberty and progress. Its ultimate price would be a revolution. The only Socialistic community we can conceive is a village owning its land in common, where people's lives are primitive and rough, their needs few and self-supplied, and social movement gone. The extraordinarily complex organisation of a modern industrial State would, we believe, prove impossible to socialise. Few people realise what Socialism actually means.

To socialise mines and railways are merely steps on the way. What we urge is needed is first to enlighten the millions of electors by telling them in the plainest and simplest language the certain consequences of Socialism to themselves. But this is not enough. The strength of Socialism lies in its attack. Cornering, sweating, profiteering, the manipulation of markets, the callous exploitation of workers, are its strongest arguments. Socialists shut their eyes to the vast improvements of the past half-century. They can, however, still point not only to abuses of the power of capital, but to

the sluggish indifference of multitudes of well-to-do people to anybody's welfare but their own. What is more, they maintain, with too much reason, that for one improvement due to the pressure of public opinion, five are due solely to force. The workers have been taught that force is a remedy, and the only remedy. That is why, if you wish people to believe what you tell them of the perils of Socialism, you have to insist on true public spirit and the sense of civic responsibility, where these are very rarely found. The civic creed of the average citizen is to pay his taxes and his debts, and to fight perhaps for his country in time of need, and otherwise to mind his own business and let other people mind theirs. It is not a bad creed, but too narrow by far for days like these.

People's minds are drifting rapidly towards Socialism, partly because they see no other way of escape from the operation of economic laws vaguely understood but severely felt, while of what is involved in Socialism they have little or no idea, but chiefly because of the absence of any adequate sense of civic responsibility. You have to enlarge the citizen's creed. He should learn what is meant by love of his country, for patriotism is a very practical virtue rather than a sentiment. He should be taught to distinguish between the man who founds an industry and enriches others as well as himself and the man who by a lucky gamble or a successful corner makes a fortune. He should find shareholders anxious not only over the amount of their dividends, but over the conditions in which their dividends are produced. He should hear less of great fortunes bequeathed, with perhaps 1.50 per cent. left to charity. He

should watch a sane and earnest public spirit at work in municipality and village.

These are some of the symptoms of that moral revolution which is inevitable if we are to escape disaster. By no other means can you counteract the influences that are bent on overthrowing, at whatever cost, the State as we know it.—Your obedient servant,

G. M. DAVIS.

Langrick, Sept. 4.

EVOLUTION AND RELIGION

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The visible cause of the present trouble is that during the war we were consuming more than we were producing, leaving behind huge debts and contracting the habit of spending. To set this right we must produce more, consume less, and pay our debts. To achieve this all of us must give up a great deal of what we think we are entitled to. Many of those who were comfortably situated before the war are now finding themselves very much poorer, and they are looking forward to a return to their former comfort. On the other hand, there is no doubt that during the war all who were able to work and who were not “called up” enjoyed very much higher “real wages” than they had ever had before. These are determined to fight most bitterly against anything that will decrease their new-found comfort. They know nothing of what that comfort cost the country, and it is necessary they should know, for

we cannot expect them to acquiesce in the loss of it till they do.

The position is worse than difficult; it is tragic, and may easily lead to revolution. If every one demands his rights it will be disaster. What, then, are the influences at work on the unselfishness and wisdom of the community? The three principal are economics, evolution, and religion, and in their root idea our economics and our evolution stand side by side and opposed to our religions. Economics treats of the wealth of nations and speaks of enlightened self-interest as the motive that drives us all in our daily lives. Evolution describes and explains this wonderful world we live in, and ascribes all forms of life in it to the ceaseless effort of every living thing to preserve itself even at the expense of others. Religion also describes and explains this world to us, but it teaches that love of others is the motive that must guide us if we wish to escape disaster, not only collectively but individually.

Which of these views is true? There is the knot we must untie. We are still living in and through the strength given us by centuries of faith, but if we do not soon face the question and solve it our faith will vanish and with it our civilisation. I am convinced that the knot can be untied, that economics, evolution, and religion can be wheeled round so as to point to a common centre. It is certain that they must do so if they are all true. In so far as economics preaches enlightened self-interest, it is false. Wherever self-interest is the only motive no form of co-operation is possible, and any society will at once fall to pieces. The happiness of an individual cannot

be attained by the pursuit of his own happiness. Only through duty can happiness be found. In a similar way the wealth of nations cannot be reached by direct pursuit. The pursuit of happiness and the pursuit of wealth are both suicidal, eliminative of those who run after them. What we need then is a new economics which will ignore wealth and take the welfare of nations for its goal, and which will preach that only by helping others can we serve our own interests.

Evolution is true, but only half the truth. It is true that every living thing is engaged in a ceaseless effort to preserve itself, and that that has produced the efficiency (and the selfishness) of the individual. But that is only half the problem. Whence come the unselfishness and the power of co-operation which are even more vital characteristics than the others? Evolutionists have hitherto, so far as I can find out, studied only the evolution of the individual, and the evolution of the group seems to have passed unnoticed, though here lies the key to the whole. Wherever selfishness is the only or even the principal motive, the group, be it family, pack or tribe breaks up. I am convinced that there is here a field for investigation from which we could produce a new science of evolution which would explain not only our bodies but our ethics, and would prove that these had as deep a reason and as long a history as our backbones.

Like evolution, religion is true, but not all true, and never at any time the whole truth. It has always sprung from the insight or inspiration (I think these are nearly synonymous) of the greatest

men, and it has always been explained and defended by smaller men of less insight. They buttressed the faith in things spiritual, which being spiritual were beyond their grasp, by miracles and by casuistic theology. The result always is that the theology grows, till like the ivy it kills the tree inside. We are very nearly at that point now. We want a new faith founded upon a fresh insight into this world and ourselves. We cannot live without it. The strength given us by the faith of our fathers is nearly spent. The Darwinian doctrine that self-preservation is the key to the whole of life is the poison which is destroying us. That, acting on German philosophy, produced the Great War. Acting on ourselves it is producing Sinn Fein—ourselves alone—the name of which ought to condemn it at once and for ever. Selfishness is suicidal. No man can live by himself. No two can live together without controlling selfishness.

Economics is built on self-interest, evolution on self-preservation. The Churches have ignored the challenge to their first principle and have sunk into harmless first-aid work. A new philosophy is needed. Anything less is merely tinkering at the outside.—Yours, etc.,

THOS. TODD (Gisborne, N.Z.).

London, Sept. 5.

STARTING AFRESH

BY G. K. CHESTERTON

IT may appear somewhat impertinent, and even grotesque, for a layman to put the Dean of St. Paul's into a pew and preach at him; but I am moved to take his sermon for my text, precisely because he is so admirably right up to a particular point, and after that so lamentably wrong. Nothing could be more right, and at the same time more rare, than his realisation that any facing of the facts at this moment is bound to be irritant and alarming. So far as that goes, I will be as gloomy as any dean. Indeed, I think the present generation owes him much for protesting against a spirit of facile and futile evolutionary optimism. But when we come to the spirit which is to be opposed to it, then it is that I leap into the pulpit of St. Paul's Cathedral and lift up my voice against its late occupant. For instance, in that quarrel of Labour and Capital which Dr. Inge himself takes as typical, both sides invoke essential elements in the Christian tradition. The more revolutionary say that the Christian spirit should specially protect the poor and denounce the tyranny of the rich; and this is profoundly true. The more conservative say the Christian spirit should specially protect the pieties and loyalties of a domestic tradition; and this also is profoundly true. But surely

there is a third thing in which the Christian spirit is more unique—I might almost say eccentric—than even the democratic or the domestic virtues. Even the pagans were often kind to their household slaves, and were almost always respectful to their household gods. Everybody knows that he can find pity in the *Iliad* or piety in the *Æneid*. There is something more peculiar and provocative in the Christian idea, and it was expressed in the words repentance and humility. Or, to put it in more topical terms, it means that when we face the facts of the age, the first facts we face should be the faults of ourselves; and that we should at least consider, concerning any fact, the possibility that it is our fault. Now, of course, the most important form of this is too individual for this public problem; indeed, it cannot in its nature be a criticism of anybody else. But there is another form of it in those more corporate cases in which a man speaks for a class, or a country, or a school, or a social type. In this public sense, also, there is no value in any pessimism that is not penitence. And I do not think that the pessimism of Dr. Inge bears the smallest resemblance to penitence.

EDUCATED ERROR

The academic authority always starts out by assuming that everything is the fault of the bricklayer or the coalheaver, simply because nobody could possibly mistake him for a bricklayer or a coalheaver. It never occurs to him to ask whether it is, I do not say his own fault, but even the fault of the instructed and secure social class to which he belongs. Now

there is one thing, I think, which is written in enormous letters across the whole history of modern times; it is the great and ghastly mistakes made by that educated class. Dr. Inge is educated in a much more scholarly sense than I am, but it is broadly true that we both belong to a certain world which has leisure to learn and even some opportunity to teach. And we have taught horribly and hopelessly wrong. We have, as a class, landed our less educated fellow-citizens in catastrophe after catastrophe, solely by the priggish fixity of our own delusions. For instance, in my early youth I believed, because all educated England believed, in the Anglo-Saxon, or Teutonic, theory of English history. I may have mentioned it to people, and swelled with my small words what turned out to be the triumphal march of Prussia. For Prussia came so near to triumph because a vague belief in a Teutonic brotherhood led us to regard the defeat of the Poles and the French as the inevitable fall of inferior and decadent races. This was emphatically not a popular error. It was solely and entirely an educated error. I never met a bricklayer who occupied that ample leisure (so much lacking in academic circles) on which Dr. Inge insists by comparing the craniological curve of Celtic and Teutonic types. It was rare to meet a coster or a cabman who traced the origin of his family to the Folk-Wanderings of the world-conquering Germanic tribe. A costermonger would laugh at a German as a foreigner, exactly as he would laugh at a Frenchman as a foreigner. And the costermonger would be right. It was all the great historians and philosophers and men of science who were wrong; and the end of whose

blunder was blood and darkness and the desolation of countless homes. Ought the educated class to talk in quite so arrogant a tone? Does it not owe the world something like an apology?

Now it is exactly the same with the problem of Labour. The first important fact about trade unions is that they were created by a dim historical instinct among the uneducated, at a time when the most hideous, unhistorical barbarism was being taught to them by the educated. The philosophy then being taught in Parliament, in the Press, and among the professors, especially of economics, was by far the most half-witted and wicked nonsense that has ever been tolerated among men nominally Christians. It was the poor who were moved, by some faint tradition, once more to build the guilds that had built the cathedrals; though they had scarcely seen the cathedrals and never heard of the guilds. It was the cultured class which told them that all such brotherhood was sentimentalism, and that men must fight for food like wolves. In this case as in the other, the poor were ignorant and right, and the rich men were instructed and wrong—so wrong that facts have forced them (in both cases) to retreat, to reversal, indeed, to revolution, to everything, in fact, except repentance, or even confession.

Bolshevism is not justice, but it is judgment. It is not what we desire, but it is not far from what we deserve. Considered as a paradise it is absurd, but considered as a deluge it has its serious and even its moral side. It is the nemesis of nonsense; especially comfortable nonsense. For those who merely say that the main truth of education is a trust

in evolution, that progress is excellent because it is slow, and that a cultured class will lead us step by step to the New Jerusalem, fitted up with filtered water and electric lamps—to them I know of nothing to be said, except certain strange and mysterious words which float only in my memory, but which come, I think, from some passage of dark irony in one of the Hebrew prophets: “Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord. Wherefore should you desire the day of the Lord? It is darkness, and not light.”

A NEW DIRECTION

Now, with a full consciousness of the danger of incurring this curse, I would say here that I myself do, in a special sense, believe in a New World. And with a full sense of the danger of the arrogance I deprecate, I will add that I am, as it happens, possibly the only person taking part in this discussion who does believe in a New World. That is to say, I believe that if the world is to be good, it really will have to be new. I do not believe the thing can be reached from where we stand by mere progress along the same path. That path of the immediate past is not a progress to be made better; it is a mistake to be unmade. For instance, Socialism may be represented as the next stage in the modern centralisation of wealth; that is why I do not believe in Socialism. Socialism *is* evolutionary; Socialism *is* natural and gradual; it is the natural evolution of Capitalism. But my New World would be the destruction of Capitalism; that is, the distribution of property. And the New World would have to be really new;

it would have to begin at the beginning. This does not mean in the least that we ought to begin abruptly and anarchically; on the contrary, any attempt to found the State on a more general experience of property must avoid wantonly insulting the remaining traditions of property where they are genuine. In that sense—of the need for sympathy and what some would call sentiment—it may be true that a true reform would not be a catastrophe, but a tendency. But the fact we have to face is that it would be the *opposite* tendency. Whether we call it evolution or revolution, it would be contrary to the course of our history at least for the last two hundred years. The whole tendency of law, literature, political philosophy, and popular science has been towards the concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands. It seems to me to matter very little whether the few handling the money are called capitalists with large incomes or officials with large salaries. Nor will I here discuss the actual complication by which even the trend to a Socialist State is being deflected towards a Servile State. The point is that we must undo all this work, and drop all the nonsense that defended it, for the only thing that has been steady has been the steady growth of inequality. There has been the wildest variety in the excuses for inequality. While the rich were growing rich there must be competition; now they have grown rich there must be no competition. A political philosophy is promptly provided for each. The iron laws of economics are remarkably flexible.

Anything worth calling a new world will mean not a new step but a new direction. We must

reverse the whole of our present tendency, which is still the Prussian tendency, and get rather into line with tendencies which we used to condemn as Latin or even as Celtic; not that these words meant very much at any time. Like the prince in many romances, we must learn from the peasant; and among all princes those who have most to learn are the merchant princes. Certainly we must not merely lecture the working man, who has, historically speaking, been as approximately right as was consistent with our systematically teaching him wrong. The working classes have in some cases been so much corrupted by culture as to ask for Nationalisation, which would indeed only mean Kultur or Prussian officialism. Indeed it would be exceedingly like the present capitalist officialism. But the working classes will not abandon it until we have a strong alternative policy of democratic distribution—the scattering of the monstrous heaps of the last hundred years.

THE UNWELCOME TRUTH

Now the war ought to have been a signal of all these simple truths; but we seem to have misread the signals in a most mysterious way. We have seen the ruin of Prussia, but we go on believing in the practicality of Prussianism. For all our talk of organisation and efficiency and social hygiene is pure Prussianism. We have seen the miracle of the Marne and the miracle of Warsaw, and still we cannot believe that the French or the Poles can fight or think or govern, or do anything except “decay” picturesquely. We still believe all the prejudices of

the nineteenth century against all the facts of the twentieth. In one sense, indeed, the war remains eternally just and necessary, not because it produced a New World, but because it prevented a New World. Prussia would have rejoiced to establish a New World; and Prussian progress was far more inhuman than Prussian reaction. But, on the positive side, we can only say that the war has done its best, as well as its worst, to tell us the truth about peasants and officials and many other matters, and we have simply refused to listen. And the reason I believe to be the very simple one with which I began—what used to be called spiritual pride. We simply cannot bear to admit that a truth dimly felt by the poor was densely hidden from the superior, or that a truth which has so long been missed in England has been found in France, and even in Ireland.

In short, I am quite “optimist” enough to believe in progress in the future, so long as I may peremptorily refuse to believe in progress in the past—I mean especially, of course, in the immediate past. One would have thought the ghastly collision of 1914 would alone have been enough to make people suspect that we have recently been on the wrong side of the road; and now crash after crash is coming on every side. “When struck by a thunderbolt it is unnecessary to consult the book of dates for the meaning of the omen.” So said the philosophical Chinaman in that great masterpiece, *The Wallet Kai Lung*. One would think so; but many of our friends are still consulting it busily, and reading out extracts to the effect that evolution and not revolution is the

key to everything. But I think their book of dates is a little out of date.

TRUTH, JUSTICE, AND FRIENDSHIP

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The reply to your question, “Is it a New World?” is a decided negative. It is the same old world and the same old humanity—the same old liars telling the same old lies, and the same old fools believing them. In pessimistic moments one feels strong sympathy with Mark Twain’s desire to have the whole lot once again in the Ark and to be alone at the bottom of the vessel with a stout auger.

In more optimistic moods one may still discover sufficient truth, justice, and friendship to dissuade from making one’s quietus with a bare bodkin. For, when one comes down to fundamentals, those are the qualities that make this world a fit habitation for a civilised individual. There is little enough of them, and it is difficult to find that little among all the jealousies, strifes, and selfishness. To make this world a happier and more beautiful place for those of goodwill—for it is obvious that it cannot at the same time be made to suit brutal and savage natures—we must develop truth, justice, and friendship. If they predominate, all other benefits will naturally follow. Without them it matters little what form of government is instituted, or whether industries are nationalised, or whether Christianity or Moham-medanism is the popular religion.

Truth can prevail only when scientific methods are used to discover it, and largely read newspapers

and magazines recognise their duty to publish it. The *Daily Telegraph* led the way with popular articles by Sir Ray Lankester. A little space devoted to popular descriptions of the work of our leading scientists would be highly beneficial and should prove very attractive. It is obvious, for instance, that a large amount of the present industrial unrest and labour demands is due to lack of knowledge of the science of economics. The cause of justice, as well as of truth, would be greatly helped by widely publishing honest statements of the earnings of our chief industries, explaining how they are allotted respectively between interest on capital, wages, and working costs.

The development of friendship, or friendly feeling, is largely dependent on social intercourse. It is a regrettable fact that the lack of it has been greatly increased in the past by religious sectarian differences. Many of your contributors have attributed the present unrest to the waning interest in Christianity; but they apparently overlook the historical fact that for nearly 2000 years it has been the cause of bitterness and strife, and that the long centuries when its power was supreme are marked by appalling wars, massacres, ignorance, and oppression. A really national Church might be the most powerful instrument in promoting sympathetic understanding among the people, but such a Church must be one to which all could resort without detriment to their intelligence and honesty. It must be prepared to accept proved scientific facts as proposed by Canon Barnes, and cease to insist upon its members professing belief in dogmas which are contrary to the discoveries of

modern times. In other words, it must be chiefly ethical and social, avoiding dogmatism and mysticism. It will be a happy day for the human race when mankind bases its views of morality upon the welfare of humanity and tolerates without ill-will all religious faiths, of the truth of which no one has definite proof.

At the root of the present unrest is the cry for justice. There is no good disguising the fact that in the past the manual and other labourers have been unmercifully sweated in order to obtain big profits upon invested capital; and now they have achieved power by skilful organisation there is little cause for wonder that they are determined to suffer no longer. Unfortunately the spirit of hatred and revenge towards the employers seems to be carrying them beyond the limits of justice in their demands; and no one can exceed those limits without himself suffering, as the employers should already realise.

The only remedy is a new heart; that is, a machine to control justly the financial flow. Parliament has shown itself unable to undertake this work effectually, and hope seems to lie in an industrial council, representing all classes and interests, with power to regulate wages and profits—not upon a basis of cost of living, which is uneconomic and therefore unjust to the community, and was only justifiable and probably inevitable as a war emergency, but according to the value of the output and the services rendered in obtaining the same. This involves the difficult task of differentiating between the value of manual, clerical, and supervisory labour, which can be done fairly if the relative capital expenditure upon training and education be taken into account.

But no such council can be effective unless it—and indeed the whole nation—is animated by a spirit of friendship; enabling past injustice and wrong to be forgiven. Therefore the great need is for a body devoted to the spreading of that spirit, than which none can be more practical and effective than such a national Church as I have sketched.—Your obedient servant,

H. STANSBURY.

THE UNSEEN FORCES

BY GENERAL BOOTH

I FEAR that, disappointing though it may seem to some whose hopes were high, I must answer, "Not yet." But even then I ask myself, is it not full soon to speak with any great certainty? There is much confusion, not only here but in Europe generally, and—for we must never leave that out of account—in the East. There is widely prevalent a state of mind which may be described as hovering. Moreover, there are some things that grow, and cannot be made—and they are usually things that grow slowly. "One inch of moral progress costs a wealth of moral pains."

All the same, some of the signs of the times are good, very good. As an example of this, I would name the new hatred of war, which is, I fancy, a much more intelligent, as it is certainly a much sterner, fact than is realised in some quarters. I think M. Poincaré may take heart here, for I believe—and I do not speak without some knowledge—that this emotion has found a deep place among the vast working populations of Germany. On the other hand, there are signs of the times which are not good; as an instance, the obvious and widespread disposition among all classes to exalt the superficial, not to say the frivolous, things in life. But we all

want time to settle down before we can begin to generalise with safety.

I am, nevertheless, optimistic rather than otherwise. The dangers ahead are, no doubt, very real and very vivid—we can see the breakers, and, for that matter, some of the rocks also; but we must not overlook the great expanse of blue water which lies further on. I remember a remark made by Lord Rosebery in the dark days (how far off they seem!) of the Boer War, that “we haven’t got to the bottom of old England yet.” I sometimes remind myself of this when I hear in these times the lugubrious, not to say lachrymose, prognostications of some, and the stupid threatenings of others, among the guides and teachers of the day. I remain in spite of it all, a convinced believer in the common sense and good conscience of the mass of our people. Notwithstanding much exploiting and a good deal of bullying by extremists of many types, and for all the danger of our present system of education, with its atrocious neglect of qualities of character, I believe that there is a soul of reasonableness and rightness in them which will in the end prevail.

RENEWING THE INDIVIDUAL

But the remarkable papers which are appearing in the *Daily Telegraph* on this subject have inspired the question put to me more than once, “Can we really have a new world?” Can the world be renewed? Can we escape the old wrongs, the old miseries, the old bonds of narrowness, of selfishness, or greed? And to this I have given answer, Yes,

but only by the renewing of the individual. Our world, with its races and communities, governed by laws and tendencies of infinite variety and of tremendous potency, is a world of men. It is made up of individuals, each contributing something of good or evil or both to the whole, and in the end determining what kind of world it shall be.

From this point of view we are in need of two or three spiritual and ethical helps to further progress to which very briefly I may be permitted to refer. I say further progress, because happily these influences are already at work amongst us. The first of these is the fear of God. I mean God conceived not only as the Governor of the universe, as many Theologians think of Him, but as the Moral, Ultimate, the Final Court of Appeal for every individual soul, before Whom in some way (there may be many ways) each of us must render an account of himself and of his life. I know that there are many conceptions of God. Probably few who read these lines could give a coherent description of their own conception, any more than they could describe what they understand by life or motive or love. And yet it is a fact that we all have some idea of what we mean. Of Him, then, however we may conceive Him, I say it is good to encourage a righteous fear.

The modern notion prevailing in some quarters, which looks on God as a kind of asset instead of a King and Judge, a Being of kindness without majesty, of love without righteousness and judging power, is surely at the root of some of our present troubles. Now I believe the war has opened the eyes of multitudes on this matter, and that in every social class

in the different nations men do see more clearly than before that above and quite beyond what they may regard as their duty to their own section of society, or to their family, or to their party, or their union, or their trade, lie their unchangeable obligations to a living God. They see that the great danger of selfishness and self-pleasing, as well as of sensuality and vice, is that these things tend to possess themselves of man's whole being, and to imprison it in the finite, to leave it no higher life beyond, and to close its eyes to Him Who alone can give the Crown of life.

To make our new world we shall need, each for himself, to throw overboard the hateful notion that has wrought such havoc in Germany during the last fifty years, that any lasting well-being can come of the use of force without love. It is easy to recognise this now in the case of the German nation. But the principle is equally true for every individual among us, and for every department of our personal as of our national life. The barbarism of war really proceeds from the same spirit as the profiteering in trade, or the grinding down of the worker in his wages, or the equally ruinous selfishness of "canny," or the holding up of a whole community by general strikes or other impediments of labour. But here, again, I find the results of the war among different peoples have been good for many. Sacrifice has triumphed over self-assertion and atavism. The law of Christ, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you," is seen to be not only a pious aspiration, or a bit of individualistic idealism, but the highest of all the fundamental laws necessary to an

enlightened and really prosperous and enduring society.

A VISION OF THE INVISIBLE

In the light which has been thrown upon that law, both upon its breach and its observance, since August 1914, the cheerless scepticism which had crept over many minds and loosened the hold of former beliefs and hopes has given way to a new revelation of the greatness of man, and of the noble thing a human life can be made with that rule for its guide. Religion, whether it be regarded as a surrender of the soul to God, or as the life of God in the soul—as the lifting up of the finite to the infinite, or as the realisation of the infinite by the finite—has ceased to be a dim and far-off mystery, and become a present reality in the knowledge of Him who was at once the Great Servant of man and the Great Sacrifice for the renewal and redemption of mankind.

After the disturbances and unsettlements of the past six years it is not surprising that many old and “well-established” notions should be shaken; but do we not all need a new vision of the Invisible? The things which are seen are temporal; the things which are not seen are eternal. The temporal so easily usurps the place of the eternal, often just because it is seen, and we are so short-sighted about the everlasting things. Lord Kitchener, who could never be accused of neglecting the things seen, said that the war would be really won by the invisible forces engaged in it. And so it was won. A high purpose, faith, a flaming courage, a humble and usually a silent devotion, even to death—were not

these among the great Invisibles, without which Haig and Foch and Beatty, and the guns and ships, for all their weight and number, would have had a poor chance? When the future historian of our times gets events into their right perspective, it will probably turn out that few things in the spacious story of human life have more illustrated and exalted the power of the moral and spiritual than the Great War. Do our people realise this lesson? Will our professors teach it? Will our pulpits preach it? I read somewhere the other day the bitter lament of an English mother upon her only son, killed at Ypres, that he had died for the country, but now she felt the country was not worth dying for. But surely he died for the spirit of righteousness, unseen but everlasting, the inmost core, the one persisting principle of humanity and God's true and final purpose for it. This

"Was service paid to things which lie
Guarded within the bosom of God's will."

Now I believe that the blindness of multitudes to the things which are eternal, the things which lie "guarded within the bosom of God's will," has, at least in part, been healed. And when I say this, I am not thinking only of this creed or that, of this Church or the other, but of some in every Church and of every creed, and others with neither Church nor creed. Nor am I thinking only of this country, or of its great Dominions, or of the United States, but of some in all the lands. So to that extent for many of us there is, if not actually a new world, a world seen in a new light; and we look to the future,

not, maybe, without our anxious hours, but with hope and confidence in the spirit, the life, and the providence of God.

THREE THOUSAND YEARS HENCE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Is it a new world? Certainly not. It is only that we are trying to make the speed too fast. Steam, electricity, flying machines, and numerous other modern discoveries are all combining to upset our perspective of time as compared with the appointed stages of the world's progress. Man is a product of evolution, so he must obey the laws of evolution, and cannot fail to be influenced by his environments. Many of our ambitions are reasonable, and may be attained in the course of centuries, but not in the short period of our present lifetimes.

I do not wish to disparage our laudable ambitions, because it is only by premature attempts and repeated failures that mankind ever attains any progress. Many of the discoveries of to-day were conceived and attempted thousands of years ago, and had not our ancestors attempted them and failed we should not to-day be again attempting them with any prospect of success. Before the days of Ancient Greece, Messenia had good underground drainage and splendid sanitation—much better than we had in London 200 years ago. One thousand years B.C. Assyria had fixed wages and prices more completely than we have endeavoured to do to-day, and had expelled her capitalist class under Moses into Palestine. Mesopotamia has not yet recovered from this setback.

The following table will give some idea of the probable rate of our future progress. In Government from A.D. 1700 to 3000 we shall evolve world-wide federations and devolutions, and by A.D. 4000 we may have succeeded in the greatest reformation of all revolutions that are to mark the evolution of government, which started between 18000 and 20000 B.C., and will complete its evolution between A.D. 7000 and 10000, viz. to confine democracy to State government, not to allow the people to elect the national government, which will then be partly elected by the local State governments and partly by the throne.

If we adhere to the idea of a League of Nations we may get some workable form of international government in 2000 years' time. This would be rapid progress as the clock of evolution moves. In the course of this 2000 or 2600 years we shall probably establish political universities, and will not permit any one to stand for Parliament who has not graduated in an economic university. In commerce we have to devote the next 1300 years to establishing as complete a system of discipline in trade as we have done in our armies during the last 3000 years. Then in the course of the following 1300 years we have to evolve efficiency, after which it will be possible to complete the evolution of co-operation between Labour and Capital.

By all means let us aim at all these objects, for past evolution predicts that they are to be the principal attainments of the next 3000 years. But in the meantime let us try to curb over-haste. Let us try to return to normal conditions. We must not

forget that the law of supply and demand has always adjusted wages, employment and unemployment, and fixed prices, and if we try to fix wages we shall destroy competition between large and small capitalists, encourage profiteering and over-expenditure in luxury and raise prices.

Let us remember also that if all incomes were equally divided the average would not exceed £175 a year throughout the working population, and would never drop below £150 a year. All that rises and falls is the birth- and death-rates. Wages and prices alter with economy and extravagance, but the living and spending power of a nation is recorded in exact proportion to its production or want of production by its graveyards. We must remember that man proposes, but God disposes.—Your obedient servant,

CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.

67, *Madeley Road, Ealing, W.* 5, *Sept.* 9.

NOMINAL CHRISTIANITY

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—It is going to be a new world in the sense that human values are undergoing revision. That we can build up civilisation according to the old standards is inconceivable in the light of what the war has taught.

The ironic circumstance of this discussion is that most of your correspondents who admit the necessity of spiritual change ultimately set their arguments on a material basis. The difficulty is to turn away

from the methods by which the old world was sustained. The waving of a flag will not induce a man now to pick up a rifle any more than he will work sixty hours a week because it was the practice so to do five years ago. It is no use calling for increased production of goods unless it is accompanied by an increased production of goodwill to meet the new ethical claims involved. To stampede the workers into a blind submission to produce without reference to "whys" and "wherefores," is to reverse emphatically the attitude that leads to real human progress. "Change of soul" requires more than an abstract recognition of its necessity. Translated into concrete form, we should find Capital showing a happier disposition towards the projects of Labour to minimise the evils that produce the want.

Were I asked the source of those evils, I would answer, in nominal Christianity. The Church was something like a South Sea Bubble until the war came and exposed its shams and travesties of true religion. It was a fashion to go to church, and also to stray very far from the pulpit the following six days. We all believed in the Sermon on the Mount, but how many of us attempted to make it a living reality? In our business relations, politics, and social life, there was always that crying need for sincerity; to act like a Christian, and to realise some sort of spiritual health by which to demonstrate the practical value of religion.

The Church failed, but not Christianity. Is the Church going to fail again? The reply to this will answer also the question as to whether there is to be a new world. Up to the present the Church has

done little to justify the belief that it has thrown its disguises permanently aside, and is no longer prepared to drag on the coat-tails of statesmen. To cite one matter only: When does the Church propose to reintroduce the doctrine of forgiveness into its teaching, and explain why it became inoperative as soon as the test came for it to be applied nationally? Those correspondents who quote freely from the Scriptures and then go on to support the antitheses of such teaching in actual life are also consciously or otherwise subscribing to maintain nominal Christianity. Progress implies the shedding of false pretences, and the present social unrest may be summed up as the effort of humanity to bring life and religion into closer relationship by gradually abrogating the errors of the past.—Yours faithfully,

V. W. G. (Working Man).

Sept. 5.

PLAYING THE GAME

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—It is quite obvious that the majority of your correspondents are not in agreement as to the meaning of the phrase “A New World.” I venture to suggest that such a world must be one in which each individual is prepared to and really does “play the game.” If we analyse our troubles, domestic and international, we shall find that they have been created through somebody—some individual—forgetting or refusing “to play the game.”

Now it seems to me that if we are ever going to get a new world—one in which everybody “plays

the game"—there are two things we have to learn : First, to trust one another, and, secondly, to practise generosity. All our industrial unrest and all our international conflicts can, I believe, be traced to the absence of these two virtues in the acts of individuals. Labour proclaims its distrust of capital, and capital asserts that it cannot rely on labour, and both, in the past at any rate, have claimed and kept every single thing to which they were entitled, whereas a little generosity would not have inflicted loss on either party, and would certainly have saved a great deal of trouble. In international affairs we find the same thing exists. One nation cannot or will not trust its neighbour, and both cling to the very smallest thing to which they are entitled, as if their life depended upon it.

The question now arises, Is this ideal one that is capable of translation into practice, or is it merely an ideal ? I think that it is one that can quite simply be put into practice, because it depends for its fulfilment upon the individual. We each live in a world of our own, and that world is made, to a great extent, happy or miserable, not so much by our environment as by our own disposition. Our disposition depends largely on how other people treat us. Other people usually act decently towards those who are decent to them. Therefore, if each individual "plays the game" when dealing with other people, it seems to me that there is a reasonable chance of the world becoming a more desirable place to live in. Even if the reliance is misplaced or the generosity abused, the knowledge that we, at any rate, have played the game is a source of comfort and happiness.

All humanity craves for happiness, and the varying ideas possessed by individuals of how this can be attained is reflected in the unrest all around us. Why does man almost instinctively associate happiness with riches? Happiness comes neither from the East nor from the West but from within. To my mind active (not passive) Christianity holds the secret of true happiness. And what does Christianity teach? It teaches men to put their trust in Him who was wise and great enough to make them do their job with a good heart and the minimum of grouching, and to see things through the other man's eyes as well as their own and act accordingly.—Yours faithfully,

JUVENIS.

THE "LEAGUE OF SOME NATIONS"

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The discussion of this question in your columns has brought forth many declarations of faith in the League of Nations. The idea that the League of Nations is a new thing naturally breeds the idea that the world is to be renewed. But is the League new? Some of its most ardent supporters try to prove that it is merely a development of the idea of co-operation, which began with the first primeval brothers-in-arms. To prove that the benefits of co-operation are twofold, one writer quotes the example of the independent cities of Europe in the Middle Ages. When they were finally constrained to join with the rest of the country, both they and the country benefited. Others would have us consider the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Here again we have a voluntary remission of a certain amount of individual liberty, rewarded by a greater communal power and prosperity.

But what is it that underlies these unions? They are not mere haphazard mixtures. Under whatever name we give it, it is still the same spirit—the sense of difference—the spirit of the Pharisee who thanked God he was not as other men. Patriotism, stripped of high-sounding phrases, such as “consciousness of one’s country’s great destiny,” comes simply to this; and the spirit that actuates all such co-operative bodies is rivalry, not, however, necessarily evil. There is no powerful organisation which has not this spirit—all our efforts are to inculcate the idea into children of tender years. We call it training “to work for the team,” leaving to be understood the equally important reason, “against another team.”

Now comes the question of the League of Nations. We cannot run this on the same lines. We have no definite idea of “the other team.” Unless we can find a few rival worlds, we must get hold of a new spirit or be content to rename the League as “The League of Some Nations.” Then it will be able to find rivals in a “League of Some Other Nations,” and so the game will be renewed. Perhaps it is ordained that such things shall be, and, after the next war “which is to end war,” contact will be made with other worlds and so on *ad infinitum*, until the whole universe is leagued together and the new spirit born.

But perhaps we need not wait so long. Our mystics always have a knack of taking short cuts, which succeeding generations of wise men obliterate with carefully-planned roads and bridges. Yet with

all their "careless rapture," the mystics always reach the goal; the wise men, never. Christ never preached rivalry. He preached to the Jews because He was born amongst them. He only brought up the question of nationality when heresy crept in, and the Word was in danger of never reaching the Gentiles. Since then the Church has done wonders, but has always suffered from this sense of difference. Schisms have made rival parties, and the energy that should have proclaimed the Word has been engaged, either in bitter controversy, or at least in calm statements of disagreement. But the necessary spirit is still awake after 2000 years. It actuated the bishops in their convention, and it must have dwelt in the originators of the League. Let us foster it, and not call our League a League against war or against oppression: our Third Internationale, not an organisation to fight Capital. Let us do away with the spirit which always seeks to be "anti-" something, and let us start each of us individually and the nation through its Government, to treat our neighbour as ourself.—I am, yours truly,

A STUDENT.

Sept. 6.

A DEFENCE OF MATERIALISM

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—May I comment, from the point of view of a scientist, on your interesting "New World" correspondence, and incidentally say a little in defence of this dreadful materialism to which, according to many

of your correspondents, the evils of the present state of affairs are due?

Beside such interesting oddities as the letter of the gentleman who blames modern education for everything that annoys him, the majority of the letters you have printed are agreed upon this—that we shall be upon the road to Utopia if we follow the teaching of Christ. The writers wholeheartedly support the Church, or indignantly criticise it, but their remedy is simple. Perhaps a mere scientist, whose concern has been more with fact than with belief, with experimental investigation rather than with blind faith, may be pardoned for searching closely through these letters for some definite indication how this moral revolution is to be brought about, how, in view of the rather dismal record of 2000 years, the simple Christianity of its Founder is to be regenerated for the creation of a new world, how, in short, our life can be spiritualised and this deadening, soul-destroying materialism banished for ever. To his regret, the mere scientist found no comfort in the vague statement that our life must be more spiritual. He still wants to know what the statement means, if it means anything; how the change is to be effected, and if it can be effected, what its results would be. Unfortunately, the scientific desire for exactness, distrust of doubtful generalisations and catch-words, and the general cautiousness and criticism of the scientist, prevent him from accepting the faith of one of your correspondents, who is quite content to wait calmly for the Second Advent. He does not question the sincerity of these beliefs; he is merely sad that this vagueness, this unreasoning belief in mere phrases

should be so enthusiastically put forward as a signpost to the new world. He respects any man who knows what he believes and why he believes it, but he respects no one who is intellectually too lazy to put into order whatever jumble of ideas he may have.

The writer is not surprised that materialism should be blamed for all that is evil, but he is surprised that the age-old error of regarding it as a vicious system which aims only at the gratification of the senses should still be expressed in your columns. When the popular imagination is caught by the hocus-pocus of Spiritualism, the hysteria and emotionalism of Theosophy, Christian Science, and the Salvation Army, perhaps it is too much to hope that materialism, after all these years, will be recognised as a definite philosophical and ethical system. The bases of its philosophy and their relation to the Einstein Relativity theory form subjects of fascinating study, but they need scarcely be gone into here, since the average man will always regard "materialist" as a term of abuse. Yet, to the writer, materialism, coupled with what is called the "scientific habit of mind," seems the only road to real progress. He understands by this the cultivation of that frame of mind which can look at facts calmly and dispassionately, which can collect and classify them and realise their relative importance, which can draw conclusions from them applicable to all normally constituted minds, and on the basis of these conclusions, suggest means and methods for achieving any desired end. Above all, it is guided by that little-headed philosophical principle known as William of Occam's razor—hypotheses must not be multiplied without necessity. It is so easy, as for

instance, Spiritualism shows, to label some unexplained phenomenon by a name and to imagine the matter has therefore been cleared up. Yet on stupid hypotheses people will build still more stupid edifices until they evolve the ridiculous crazes of the day. The writer, using Occam's razor, finds that the hypothesis of the Deity is unnecessary to him—its acceptance would have no effect whatever on his life or his conduct—so he is content to build his work on what he knows and what he can verify. Emotionalism and sentimentalism, however comforting they may be, he recognises as inimical to careful thought and to sane judgment—yet sentiment and emotion will always be part and parcel of the ordinary man's mental equipment, not trained and controlled, but so unrestrained as to guide and control all his actions.

Controversy is already beginning in the Press on the subject of Canon Barnes's sermon to the British Association at Cardiff. Though one cannot but praise the reasonable spirit of most of the sermon, it is rather tragic to find the Church (or rather the liberal-minded minority) admitting, after half a century, the truth of the evolutionary theory. The writer is reminded of an educated business man of his acquaintance who firmly believed in perpetual motion. Canon Barnes rightly points out that between a liberal interpretation of the Bible and the conclusions of science there is no antagonism. It is the initial hypotheses of Christianity that the writer cannot accept. The following passage occurs in the sermon :

“Surely the universe had a beginning and therefore a creator. It cannot be a meaningless dance of atoms or a whirl of electrons that has gone on for infinite

time. Surely, too, evolution describes a wonderful development, an upward progress, which implies a design in the mind of God. Surely man is on earth the present end of this process, and his spiritual qualities, his love of beauty, goodness, and truth are its crown."

It is statements of this kind, disputable logically and scientifically, coming especially from a man of the Canon's attainments, that have produced in the writer a philosophy of pessimism with regard to the new world. A study of social psychology, of the average man and his beliefs and ideas, his ethics and his philosophy, his pleasures, his literature, and his art, will show the Canon how much of spiritual qualities, of love of beauty, goodness, and truth, mankind as a whole possesses.

When mankind begins to use its brain and to think, when it becomes rational and civilised, then we may hope for the coming of the new world. Since, however, mankind shows no desire to do anything of the kind, but is satisfied completely by Miss Pickford and Mr. Bottomley, the idea of a New World is valueless even as a scenario for the "pictures."—Yours, etc.,

N. K. SMITH, B.Sc.

254, Barcombe Avenue, S.W. 2, Sept. 6.

THE SECOND COMING

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Most of your correspondents seem to agree that it is a new world in which we are living, they disagree as to whether it is a better or a worse world, and disagree more strongly still as to the essential

factors which are necessary to the making of a better world. To most minds this latter term implies a greater production of goods, and a better distribution of wealth, with the necessary concomitant, a higher standard of living. Who will set the standard and how we shall be made to conform to it is not quite clear. We seem to be taking as our model for a heaven on earth the charlady's epitaph: "Where there ain't no dishes to wash and nothing to do for ever and ever," the type of philosophy preached by the whilom person who gave us as an alternative a tank of fire and brimstone. Under the circumstances one could not wonder at the poor buffer who wanted a place in the middle.

It is just this place in the middle we are seeking to find. The solution obviously entails four factors, political, economic, social, and religious. It is this last factor on which I should like to be allowed to dwell, as it is of paramount importance. Several writers have taken this point of view, and have almost implied that without God's direct intervention men's effort is not likely to be successful. It is fairly obvious that God's intervention is only likely to take place in one way, and that is by His actual presence on earth. God has promised to revisit the earth, and it is quite feasible to suggest that this is the time of His second coming, also that the world unrest is the problem which He is coming to solve, and that it can be solved in no other way. The very facts that we are solemnly discussing the new world, that we have subconsciously acquired the habit of referring to the war as Armageddon, and also that we so frequently speak of the Millennium, proves that we are

accustoming ourselves to the idea that this is "the appointed time."

It may be that God is even now knocking at the door awaiting admission, and that the prayer "Thy Kingdom come (on earth)" has been answered. I am prepared to give incontestable proof at the proper time, that this is so, and that God is merely waiting for recognition to come forward and inaugurate that peace we all say we so desire. We must remember the reception He received on the last occasion, and not be surprised that He is not in a hurry to interpose in the affairs of man at the time when every man's hand is against his brother's. The question we have to decide is how long do we wish this state of affairs to continue. One of God's finest pieces of creation was the idea of evolution, and we are reaping the results of evolution, with man acting as a free agent.

Without going into the above question of proofs, may I be allowed to point out, briefly, circumstantial evidence that this is the new world for which we have waited so long? The capture of Jerusalem and the return of the Jews to the promised land: characteristically, we have made nothing of this fact, or the part His nation has played in the event. Every Britisher knows, deep down in his heart, that this is the greatest event of modern times. Its deep significance cannot have been lost on any one.

Then as to the sub-conscious references to the war as Armageddon, and to the prospective times of peace as the Millennium, the universal unrest is without historic parallel. It is literally a time when every man's hand is against his brother. Father is

fighting against son, or preparing to do so, and so on. We have just perpetrated the same crime which, in my opinion, brought about the descent of man. Was not Adam's crime that he tasted of the tree of knowledge, that he knew good from evil, that he had probed into the mystery of God, that he was finding out what God is—*i. e.* that he was, as it were, short-circuiting the evolution and upsetting the pre-ordained current of events, even before Christ had appeared to make the great sacrifice? This was a real crime in God's eyes, and if man had succeeded in evolving a truth which has ever been so near and so simple that a child could grasp it, man would have been as God. While man would have saved himself an immense amount of trouble, he would have lost to a much greater extent in the way of experience, and he would have lost his chances of salvation. This time man has succeeded in probing the mystery, but it has come to us through science.

Another piece of evidence is the formation of a universal language. This is a *sine qua non* to the formation of a new world, and corresponds with the building of the Tower of Babel. This was meant to ascend up to heaven, another attempt to probe the mystery of God. The punishment for this was to scatter the nations, and to make them speak with diverse tongues. This edict has obviously been withdrawn, for in one month we could all be speaking one tongue if we wished. This we must do before God can address people in all parts of the world.

The presence of anti-Christ's who are almost deceiving the elect; consider Bolshevism and kindred institutions. The answer to the question, Is this a new

world? is decidedly "Yes." The new world is already forty years old. It dates back to the birth of Christ. It includes that extraordinary period which has seen a material advance such as the world has never known before in such a short space of time. It includes a period of unparalleled strife and unrest which will culminate in universal peace and brotherhood; and, hard as has been the battle, the prize will be worthy of the struggle. The watchword for mankind is Peace and Goodwill, for never have the auspices been so favourable.—Yours, etc.,

A. O.

IN 1765

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—“At the same place nine journeyman taylors were convicted of combining to raise their wages and to lessen their hours of work. Upon which two were committed to Newgate for one year, five for six months, and two for three months. They were, besides, each fined 1s. and adjudged to find security for good behaviour for one year after the expiration of their respective terms of imprisonment.” (From the *Universal Magazine*, volume of the year 1765, page 218.)

If you could put your question, “Is it a New World?” to the nine men mentioned above, do you not think with me that their answer would be “Yes”? —Yours faithfully,

ALGERNON M. REVELEY.

Boston House, New Broad Street, E.C., Sept. 9.

FOUNDATION OF SOCIAL FABRIC

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—May I be permitted, as one who has lived throughout the Victorian era, to thank Sir Sidney Lee for his timely and valuable contribution to the correspondence going forward in your columns? If, instead of frittering their time away, people would only turn to our past history and learn its lessons, we should arrive at much sounder conclusions and principles of action than obtain to-day. Possibly the greatest mistake that is made to-day is, as Captain King reminds us, losing sight of the teachings of Jesus Christ. When asked which was the first and great commandment He replied, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul and strength," and He added, "The second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." No wonder that the common people heard Him gladly. The whole social fabric hangs on these two pegs, and cannot be built upon any other foundation.—Yours, etc.,

J. H. TAYLOR.

Daisy Bank, Buxton, Sept. 8.

THE WILL TO LIVE

BY THE REV. HERBERT BARNES

WE have often been told that in the critical periods of history it is the soul of the people that really counts, that "where there is no vision the people perish." In the most critical hour of the world's evolution when, in the turning and overturning of the very foundations of civilisation, all familiar landmarks have been obliterated, all old ideals have been either dimmed or forgotten, and everything we once held necessary to the stability and progress of human life seems to be in the crucible, was there ever greater need for clear vision, and the faith and courage to translate the vision we see into living terms?

It is inconceivable that the world should ever go back to what it was in 1914. It is impossible that it should remain in its present disordered and chaotic state. There is only one way left open—it must go forward to higher and better things.

We are living in a tangled and perplexing world. Inexplicable difficulties are with us and ahead of us. It is well to remember, however, that this is only a preparatory period, and we are making all the mistakes incidental to that period. It is the law of life that nothing new ever comes into being in this world except through suffering and pain, and struggle. Surely something new and wonderful is even now in

the birth-process in the life of humanity, forced into being through all the suffering and pain that afflicts mankind to-day. We have made one fundamental mistake. We thought that the end of the war would usher in a golden age; we fondly dreamed that this sorry scheme of things would be shattered to bits and remoulded nearer to the heart's desire. New worlds never come into being that way. They are gradually built by the toil and travail of man.

Wherein does the hope of the new world lie? When Abraham Lincoln was asked, "In whose hands does the future of America lie?" he replied, "The future of these States will be moulded by their prophets and teachers and good citizens." I venture to say that the bulwark of any nation is just there. It is ideas and ideals that rule the world. What men think finally determines what they feel, what they do, and what they are. For that reason the greatest men are those who release the greatest and truest and most exalting ideas. Every great idea sets free action, widens thought, extends vision, and opens up new lands of enterprise and expectation. No one can deny that men are thinking faster, further, and more searchingly than they have thought for many a day. Out of the suffering and breaking of hearts new thought-patterns are being woven, which by inevitable logic will become action-patterns, and lead to a new way of life. Examples are many and near at hand. There are new faiths, new hopes, and new determinations in the world. Never before were so many people thinking of a better world—never was there so much resolve that it should come. Whatever we may say of this age, it is an age that is

alive, and there is a new thinking invading every single department of human life. It has entered industry, and industry will be revolutionised; it has entered internationalism, and we in our day will see a vital League of Nations; it has entered politics, and politics are no more the things they were; it has entered religion, and men like Canon Barnes can see that the truth of science and the truth of religion are one; it has entered education, and education is going to be no more a thing of rates and schedules and payment by results, but a human dynamic, whereby men and women are equipped for the living of life. All this is but the preparation for the new day. The new day has not yet come, but there are seers and prophets among us who can discern the dawn.

MAKING THE CITIZEN

The new world will be democratic—nothing can stop that. But if democracy is to be safe it must be educated. Massed ignorance does not make for wisdom. Carlyle said that when we are ruled by the majority we are ruled by ignorance, and he was right so long as the majority are ignorant. Citizenship involves knowledge. No one must be denied the opportunity of obtaining the necessary equipment for citizenship. Such is the democratic necessity laid upon us. It is an imperative demand that the period of education should be prolonged. Between the ages of fourteen and eighteen the passions find themselves and take on their ideal purpose. It is then or never that the citizen is made. Yet it is exactly at that age that youth is swept off out of school to work. It is wicked. These are the seed

years, the formative years. Youth must be given time to try its powers, to release its energies, to find its vent, to realise that life is the friend and not the enemy of the human race. And is there any need to say that education must be democratic? It must get rid of this feeling of caste; it must be inclusive, and not exclusive. It must tell every one that he is one with his fellows in origin and destiny. The education that makes cynics and sceptics and snobs is not only stupid—it is wicked.

The old maxim was that knowledge is power; but before education really performs its mission in life it will have to be rooted in the conviction that knowledge is love. For that reason the education of the future must not simply be intellectual—it must be moral and spiritual and social. There must be a recognition of education as a spiritual force, a dynamic power that will help to build the new world of which we dream. Is that not something we have lost in this country during the last two decades? There was a time in the history of our nation when there was a real passion for education as such; it was something that illumined life and made it better and bigger. But in more recent times it is only a preparation for a livelihood. We have bowed down before the god of utilitarianism, and think that when we can do our typewriting and shorthand and mental arithmetic we are an educated race. The new world demands a different conception of things. Teaching is a sacrament of communication. It is not the giving of information, but of inspiration. It is not the pouring of water into a cistern, but the opening up of a spring. That is the conception of education

we need. It will prove that Lincoln was right—the future of our country is with the teachers.

Where is the hope of your better world? Where but in this single fact? There are fifteen million boys and girls in this land under the age of sixteen! I point to that as your new England. Build there. What are twelve million square miles of Empire compared to that? The latter is the language of bigness only, not of greatness. Greatness is a thing of the soul, and we have to think in terms of righteousness if we would make the title “Great Britain” eloquent of moral splendours.

It is not yet the new world, but the new world is on the way. I venture still to believe in democracy, and I venture still to say that we are making a world safe for its ideals. I do not blind my eyes to the evils that exist. It is like a ghastly panorama, passing before the eye of the spirit, to look forth upon society to-day. I do not deny these things nor attempt to explain them away; but still I dare to affirm that they are all the larval, surface things; they do not reveal the hidden depths where the new world is forming. All the good work that has been done throughout the ages has not been swept away. Just as surely as the insect must at last ascend out of the shattered and discarded cerements of the larva, so the new and better world must liberate itself and come to its own. The ideals that have been awakened cannot remain passive. Life is a living and growing thing. We see it to-day breaking through existing forms but ascending to higher and newer forms. The strife of industry, the deceit of diplomacy, the reactions of politicians—they are all

as nothing as compared with the will to live. There is an inwardness in human society that these outer facts can never destroy. And, after all, the new world will proceed from within. All social watch-words are, first of all, spiritual facts. Structure follows desire, as desire follows vision. Revelation precedes reformation. The seer comes before the doer. I still believe in the new world because there is still vision among the people.

LEAGUE OF THE LAW-ABIDING

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The birth travail of the new world began on March 4, 1914. Its age being a little over five years, compared to its length of life—roughly, 2000—it is too soon to pass an opinion upon such a tender infant. The interest centres upon the end of the old. The old firm began to close up about 1795. Several broad influences began then which culminated in this war. They can be classed: (1) political sores, revolutionary movements, etc.; (2) cessation of the people to support autocratic government; (3) overthrow of political religion; (4) the scorching power of criticism directed to every phase of government, religion, and society; (5) anger and deep-laid plans of reprisal in the autocratic camp; (6) the exhaustion or drying-up of the spiritual ideals which hitherto nourished autocratic power: its worst elements (easily classed under three heads—dominating ambition, false philosophy, and bone-deep barbarism) making common cause to destroy democracy; (7) the

removal of the artificial barriers between peoples, so that clearer understanding of world problems showed things in their true light to be but the struggle of two opposed ideals : brute domination and spiritual liberty.

These influences, working side by side throughout the century, had their climax in the Armageddon which we have passed through so far, though we are still in the turmoil of its later phases. The final decision is yet to be. Scorn of the most terrible kind will be the lot of the losers. Autocracy has been weighed and found wanting. Democracy is in the scales at the present time.

Call it what you will, a great audit, a day of judgment, or a harvest of results, we certainly are reaping what we have sown in opposition to the wisdom of past ages. Government, which should be the result of wisdom, the experience of experts trained in governing, has become dominated by the ignorant and inexperienced, the perverse and the faddist.

In religion, too, relaxation is rife. All the old tricks to control those who will not control themselves have been exposed. Hell fire and torments are no more. Love and eleventh-hour forgiveness are the order of the day, until God's law and power are things of nought. Moral law, with all its cruelty and hardness, is now relaxed, until immorality and perjury are lightly regarded. Granted the old restraints seemed at times cruel, what restraining influence can take their place ?

In education the vital everyday things have never been taught to the people. Was it in malice the education which turns out unemployable men at its highest was given to the people ? The mass must

work. Men as men, women as women; but this life-work is not taught. The young are kept from physical strain to such a late age, they are unfit for the fatigue of labour.

Economic laws have not been taught even in the most elementary form. People still think a shop-keeper gets his goods for nothing and the price they pay is all profit. Pride in work, pleasure in craftsmanship, have been relaxed; obligation and duty are disregarded.

Commerce, too, has disregarded straight dealing and honour; but I am inclined to exonerate it, because it has truly followed its duty in supplying what is demanded from it. Cheapness it gave. Now high prices are demanded from it, and high prices must be paid. Commerce hurts either way.

What is the New World? When it evolves it will be controlled by the League of Law-abiding Men. This will be an unseen Government. None can enter it who is not in every sense a true man. What is a true man? One who has come out of all the trials and hardships of life. Like a stone, he has been shaped with mallet and chisel, or, like clay, he has been moulded and passed through the fire. Such men attain all this world can give—riches, honour, and power in all their varying degrees; but they never desire to enforce their will upon others—to dominate or rule. They form a civilisation none can enter but themselves, because the untrue man cannot comprehend such a state. All those who enter not through this gate, but climb the walls or strive to break in, are thieves and robbers.

The rabble of the world are attacking this city in

force now. In the humblest walks of life any attainment to well-being, the result of character, brings hatred upon them, so that it is not surprising that the whole social State is in danger of destruction from the hordes of envy, hatred, and malice. Supposing the movement of Lenin and Trotsky does succeed in destroying the social fabric of the whole world, the city of law-abiding men will still rule the world. Forces will ever be against it, will combine in strength to overthrow it; but all these will be destroyed.

The new world will still be a world of striving, in which character only will succeed. For this is an unalterable law. It is unwise to prophesy; but the lesson that has to be acquired in this coming age is true co-operation, real brotherhood. If I interpret what I see aright it is this. We are travelling parallel to the revolutionaries of 1795. The barrier they threw down then is small compared with that which will be overthrown now (or has been in Russia). Thereafter a chain of events similar to those of Napoleon will lead to armed columns of people of every tribe reeling like drunken forces through the land, reversing the former direction from west to east—now east to west.

A personal touch. I take the proffered hand of death; in a flash am in a realm of beautiful light. A voice says, "See, men thought to accomplish a great deal. Look what they have done." And miles below I see a tiny sphere covered with heaps like Ypres ruins! And I should prefer to be thus out of it.—Yours, etc.,

GEORGE S. TANNER.

Godalming, Sept. 10.

CONGESTION AND EMIGRATION

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—The Dean of St. Paul's has laid an unerring finger on the weak spots of our national life in its Christian aspect. Personally I feel sure the weakness lies in the economic and political exigencies so admirably summed up by your correspondent Mr. Nendick. As he suggests, and as Malthus clearly predicted, excess of population such as ours creates problems, the more so as man is removed from his natural surroundings to a highly artificial life, such as our great cities present. Christianity cannot deal with men who are caught up in a perpetual and rapidly increasing vortex. It is more than the whirr and roar of machinery. Its work is individual and personal. Instead, therefore, of asking the question whether Christianity has failed with regard to our civilisation, would it not be more to the point, as Mr. Nendick suggests, to deal with the conditions which prevent its message meeting with an adequate response?

As a Colonial, I feel that the only solution is the safety valve of an intelligent diffusion of your surplus population. The great free spaces of the Dominions are practically unpopulated, and Western Canada alone can easily support your excess of people. The work of this society (the Fellowship of the Maple Leaf) is to spread British teachers of high ideals throughout the prairie provinces, but in the course of our work we are simply inundated by people who wish to go out in one capacity or another. They have no chance here, but under an intelligent emigration

system they would develop capacities that are simply submerged in an overcrowded country such as this.

Personally, having just come from Western Canada, I am appalled at the congestion around me and the evils which a highly artificial civilisation has engendered. In the last analysis it is safe to say that what drove Germany to take up arms was a pressure commensurate with what we are experiencing here, which, if it does not find an outlet in war or colonisation, will develop social anarchy in its extreme form. Given a country of wide expanses and an intelligent emigration policy, I venture to predict a renaissance of the Anglo-Saxon race.—Faithfully yours,

P. J. ANDREWS, Acting Director of the
Fellowship of the Maple Leaf.

18, *Victoria Street, S.W.* 1, *Sept. 9.*

PATRIOTISM AND SOCIALISM

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph.*

SIR,—I am much amused, as a Socialist of some thirty years' standing, to note Mr. Davis's plea for the morality of Socialism and his fear of its realisation in industry. If I were asked to define the basic moral principles of Socialism I could not do it better than in Mr. Davis's own words, that "Socialism is a moral revolution which will replace the incentive of private gain by the incentive of social service, so that a man will do his best for the general welfare rather than for himself alone."

It is quite evident that from the moral standpoint Mr. Davis is quite as convinced a Socialist as I am.

He is, however, not convinced that such a high moral principle can also become the principle of our industrial system. There is nothing fresh in his principle. It has been in the world 2000 years, as it is Christ's social teaching also. Why, then, has it not long ago been incorporated in our lives? Simply because the industrial system is founded on a quite contrary principle, that of each for himself, etc., and the economic largely dominates the mental and moral. As this individualistic principle demands that we devote six days to the maintenance of ourselves and families, and largely engrosses our thoughts on the seventh, it precludes almost entirely the possibility of working on any alternative principle except as a casual exception.

If Mr. Davis is convinced that the principle he has enunciated is the best for society, then let us have it in every department of life—in our industrial system, in our work, as well as in our sentiments. Let us make it our environment from the economic to the spiritual. Do not let us say, "As a moral principle it is excellent, but for God's sake do not let us incorporate it in our industrial system." If Mr. Davis will cease to regard Socialism as a terrible bogey, and look it straight in the face, he will find that it is the only method by which his principle can be incorporated in society.—Yours, etc.,

T. D. B.

8, *York Street, Manchester, Sept. 10.*

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Certain facts seem to stand out from the admirable articles and letters appearing in your paper. Put baldly, they are as follows : We are face to face with revolution, at worst anarchy and bloodshed, at best an economic blockade and starvation. “ You must give us all you have ” is the cry, with the revolver at our heads, “ or we will take it.” The cause of this is calculated selfishness ; that is, the death of the conception of our duty to our neighbours. This in turn springs from the practical denial of God, for it is impossible to have the brotherhood of man apart from the Fatherhood of God. All philosophies, economics, and social schemes have been tried and failed. The wrangling and strife only increase. There is no driving power in anything strong enough to make people exercise self-control, justice, or sympathy except in religion. There is no God ; we shall do as we please ! There is no fear of hell nowadays as a deterring power. (We have to thank Dean Farrar’s *Eternal Hope* for that.) Heaven does not attract us, because we shall all arrive there somehow or other, or because it is best to make the most of this world and not worry about the future. (We have to thank Darwin’s conception of the survival of the fittest as the basis of industrial materialism for that.)

If these are the elemental facts, and I think most thoughtful people will admit them, we must next look for the remedy. “ The Church has failed,” people cry. Pardon me ; I challenge any one to

find a time after the first century when the Church—that is the clergy and faithful laity—was stronger than now. “But she cannot reach the masses.” Quite true. The latter will have nothing to say to institutional religion. The attack on her, however, is so weak and vague that it shows the fault does not lie at her door. The real reason was given nearly 2000 years ago. The love of the world is incompatible with the love of God, and hence of His servants, His Word, and His society. The masses, blinded by material prosperity, are prejudiced against Christianity, and have no idea what it really means. This is not due to the Church’s failure to tell them, but to their failure to come and listen to her.

What, then, is to be done? Throw down our hands in despair? Certainly not; but let us change our method of propaganda. The pulpit can no longer remove ignorance and prejudice, or inculcate the truth. The only agency that can do so is the Press. The daily papers reach every one, and give scope for free debate and thorough investigation. Most of the best papers admit religious discussion to a limited extent, but many others avoid it as unpopular. But if the safety of the present world, to say nothing of the next, is at stake, surely the Press of the country will have to make religion one of the chief planks in its platform. So long as religion is looked on as the fad of a few feeble cranks it will be ignored; but when it is realised that the very existence of civilisation is threatened with disaster, and that the triumph of spirit over matter is the only remedy, then, as your columns now indicate, the keenest interest will be roused.

One word in conclusion. Let not readers conclude from what I have said that the function of the Church is over. Sheep still need a fold from the wolf, travellers an inn, and all of us a home. Never was there a greater need of a strong, living Church.—Yours, etc.,

JOHN A. SHARROCK.

Holy Trinity Vicarage, Worcester, Sept. 9.

THE CHURCH'S "ADMISSION" OF FAILURE

THE EDITOR, *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—With reference to the reply to "Artisan" by "Athanasius Anglicanus," in your issue of the 4th inst., I would like to say that others beside "Artisan" are of the opinion that the Anglican Church has failed; and the failure has been frankly acknowledged in the reports issued under the auspices and authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury. "Artisan" might have established his contention by quoting from those reports, which evidently "Athanasius Anglicanus" has not read.

If "the Church has never been more efficient than now," how comes it that something like 85 per cent. of the adult population are outside the churches? What is the reason for the alienation of the democracy from the Church? The representatives of the democracy have told us that the Church in the past has opposed factory Acts, free education, poor law reform, old age pensions, housing reform, and Labour legislation of all kinds for safeguarding the lives and liberty of men, women, and children.

They maintain that Church institutionalism leads to intolerance, superstition, and the loss of liberty. They have learnt that officialism, institutionalism, and tradition have put a dead hand on the Church as upon other organisations. Nor are they alone in taking such a view, as the late Dr. Alexander Mac-laren, of Manchester, said some years ago: "Officialism is the dry-rot of all churches, and is found rampant amongst democratic Nonconformist communities." Democracy believes that in the past the Church has been on the side of the strong against the weak, of the capitalist against the workman, of the rich against the poor. They say that men like Carlyle, Froude, and Ruskin have done more for their material welfare than the leaders of the Church, excepting such men as Maurice and Kingsley. It has been stated that the bishops of the Church of England have nearly always opposed democracy in its fight for liberty, equality, and justice.

The question is whether there are any grounds for such statements as indicated above. I venture to submit that there is abundant evidence to support the arguments of "Artisan." Without giving particular instances of the action or inaction of the bishops in the House of Lords on measures affecting the welfare of the "common-people," let me quote the Bishop of Winchester. In writing the introduction to the Archbishops' Report of the Fifth Committee of Inquiry, "Christianity and Industrial Problems," he said: "The report represents the belief that the time requires a new beginning on the part of the Church in defining its attitude to the economic and social life of the nation. To admit the necessity

for a new beginning is to imply that something has been wrong in the past, and to acknowledge the need for repentance. The admission and acknowledgment are both frankly made in the report. The matter for repentance has been in part an undue subservience to the possessing, employing and governing classes in the past."

The confession is made in the following extract from the report referred to: "We have neglected to attack the forces of wrong. We have been content with ambulance work when we ought to have been assaulting the strongholds of evil. We have allowed avarice and selfishness and grinding competition to work havoc over the broad spaces of human life. We want a strenuous reaffirmation of the principles of justice, mercy, and brotherhood as sovereign over every department of human life. . . . In the fifty years which laid the foundations of modern England the influence of the Church as a witness to social righteousness was, it is hardly an exaggeration to say, almost negligible. It helped, through the establishment of the National Society, to sow seeds of what afterwards became a national system of education; and individual Churchmen like Sadler, Shaftesbury, Oastler, and Bull, vicar of Brierley, fought for factory legislation in the face of an overwhelming body of complacent indifference or embittered hostility. But against the prevalent materialism of the age, with its sacrifice of human welfare to the rage of productivity, its reverence for the rights of property and its contempt for the rights of men and women, against the industrial oppression which ground the workers in factory and mines, and the political

oppression which culminated in Peterloo, the Church raised no voice of warning or protest."

The reading of that report from which the above extract is taken ought to convince even "Athanasius Anglicanus" that the Established Church has not in the past been "alive to the many problems with which Christians are now confronted." It is, however, a matter for thankfulness that there are men in the Established Church brave and courageous enough to admit the error of their ways, and we should be thankful for the "Encyclical Letter recently issued by the bishops of the Anglican Communion." It will, however, require more than encyclical letters to win back the people to the Church. There is a consensus of opinion among the most intelligent of the laity that the creeds of the Church are out of date, and the rigid adherence to the creeds is responsible for her losing her hold on the nation's manhood. While science in all its branches is ever ready to adapt itself to every new discovery of an advancing age, the creeds of the Church still retain their ancient form.

Nor is it only the intelligent laity who object to the creeds. For instance, the late Bishop Westcott, speaking of the Thirty-Nine Articles, said: "It is that I object to them altogether, and not to any particular doctrines. I have at times fancied it was presumption in us to attempt to define and determine what Scripture has defined. The whole tenor of Scripture seems to me opposed to all dogmatism, and full of application." And even Cardinal Newman said: "Freedom from symbols and Articles is abstractedly the highest state of the Christian

communion and the peculiar privilege of the primitive Church."

It is now generally admitted that Jesus Christ formulated no creeds, prescribed no ritual, and formed no ecclesiastical organisation. Why people should be bound by creeds which were drawn up in the fourth century by men who were neither as enlightened nor as divinely inspired as those of the twentieth century is incomprehensible. As Dean Farrar, when writing on the genuineness of the Second Epistle of St. Peter, said: "The Second Epistle is accepted as St. Peter's mainly on the authority of the Church of the fourth century; but the Church of the fourth century had not the least pretence to greater authority, and had a far smaller amount of critical knowledge, than the Church of the nineteenth."—Yours faithfully,

J. P. DONOVAN.

Cathay, Thorn Road, Worthing, Sept. 5.

A NEW WORLD?

AN EDITORIAL

TO-DAY we bring to a close the remarkable correspondence which has been running in our columns for some four weeks, and which has elicited several valuable letters from thoughtful students of history as well as from practical men. The question we ventured to propound to our readers, "Is it a New World?" based upon a characteristic and most able communication from Dean Inge, has been answered in various ways according to the instincts, the prejudices, and beliefs of each individual writer. The theologian has answered it in terms of his own faith; the scientific man has propounded his solution according to his conception of exact and reasoned truth; the economist has discussed the matter with a real perception of the value of economic study in solving our present problems; and the ordinary thoughtful man, looking round upon the world as it exists, has reached specific conclusions either in moods of hopefulness, or, perhaps more often, in moods of despair. The one thing that is quite clear in our present discontents is the fact that after the blithe and easy optimism induced by the Armistice we have since been confronted with a species of pessimism very hard to combat because resting on few reasoned convictions. A sense of failure and

frustration is no doubt abroad. Indeed, if we are living in a new world it is one which is declared to be as bad as the old world. But according to the majority of our correspondents who do not take extreme views, the world is not new, inasmuch as it preserves within itself many of the weaknesses and drawbacks of its predecessors; but yet assuredly is new for those of eager faith who look to the gradual development of higher standards of life and conduct both in States and individuals, arising slowly but surely out of the welter of decaying and disappearing civilisations. It is obvious that neither pessimism nor optimism suits the facts. There is no reason to give up the eternal struggle against wrong, injustice, and slavery, but rather to remember how few years, relatively speaking, divide our modern world from the brutal and grotesque barbarisms of the past.

On the whole we feel justified in expressing no little satisfaction with the correspondence which has occupied so many of our pages during the past month. The argument throughout has been conducted on a high plane, and evidently has enlisted the interest of men of light and leading. It has shown that throughout our community there exist large bodies of men whose minds have been much stirred by our recent experiences and who are anxious to do what they can to promote all possible reform. The political questions have been shown to rest on a basis far deeper than the ordinary superficial disputes of the time. However much we may be satisfied, or displeased, with current political conditions, it has been generally understood that they involved ethical considerations which will in the long run decide the issue.

For if we had to express by a single phrase the real purpose of the disastrous war, which has gone so far to ruin Europe, we might define it as a struggle for two different conceptions of the State and the relation of the individual to it. Is the proper conception of the State that it is "non-moral," that it is occupied solely with administrative functions or with affairs of police, providing a sort of soulless machinery to keep, as it were, an external tranquillity among its members? Such, it will be remembered, was the conception which Gladstone attributed to his great rival—though very unjustly as we know from Mr. Buckle's recent volumes on Disraeli. It is a purely negative conception, "administrative nihilism," as Professor Huxley once called it, which, dissociating politics from ethics, and, indeed, from sociology, regards the State as a useful weapon to preserve external order. But it assuredly was under no such uninspiring idea as this that our young men enlisted in their thousands to fight their country's battles. To their minds the State, of which they constituted themselves the champions, is in its essence moral, enlisted in the cause of justice and righteousness and mercy, and aiming for its members at the largest amount of freedom compatible with an organised community. The non-moral State is a Prussian idea. To Englishmen, however, and to those who were conjoined with us in our desperate struggle against Teutonic autocracy, political principles are not to be dissevered from ethical, and the things which are right or wrong for the individual are recognised as equally right or wrong for the State as a whole. No clearer characteristic can be found in

the mass of correspondence which has reached us than the constantly reiterated assertion that, if, indeed, we desire a new world, we must reform the individual and seek for the basis of the new order in a profound recognition of ethical truths.

Such a correspondence as this has its pathetic as well as its instructive aspects. We learn from it with how wistful a longing the men who fought for us in this war, contrast the temper and spirit of 1914 with the lowered vitality and withered hopes of 1920. We have received letters from mothers struggling painfully to attain or retain a cheerful outlook on the future by no means justified by their melancholy experience. Now and again we have read letters of pitiful surrender, when a man is tempted like Job to curse God and die. Or else we have found, despite all difficulties and insoluble problems, the resolute faith which endures all vicissitudes and triumphs over the facile scepticism of worldly cynics. Naturally we have not been able to publish more than a tithe of what we have received, and sometimes we have had regretfully to omit letters which, frank and eloquent enough, have too intimate and personal a note for publication in our columns. The general impression we have received from the mass of correspondence can be easily defined. You cannot call the age a new one if it reproduces so many of the vices of its predecessor: the only thing to do is to try patiently and painfully to improve here and cut off there, hoping almost against hope that humanity, which alters so little through the ages, may learn lessons from past experience, and discover how best to heal its own wounds. We cannot improve society

at large, unless we begin with the improvement of the individual; the responsibility rests on each of us to cultivate our own garden and get rid of weeds. From a wider point of view we can look at large institutions as helpful in the cause of reform. Some will ask us to trust to Science and realise facts; others bid us to turn once more to the ancient founts of inspiration, and give the Christianity of Christ a fresh trial. But the one thing we must not do is to fold our hands and say that "the struggle nought availeth." Despair cuts the sinews of effort and closes the battle before it has properly begun. Nor must we abandon our old ideals. It is true, of course, that they have not turned out so efficacious as we had hoped, and their partial failure is a potent source of discouragement. But perhaps we have taken a wrong view of their value. Ideals are not forces. They have no dynamic energy unless they are conjoined with a will. And the corporate will of humanity still waits to be born through the agency, as we hope, of the League of Nations.

172121

Daily Telegraph, London
Is it a new world?

So
D1338i

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

